DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 143 637 95 SP 011 405

AUTHOR Howes, Nancy J.
TITLE Factors Affecting the Institutional Development of CBTE Programs. Vol. 3, Organizational Change Process.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Albany. Teacher Education Developmental Service.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Teacher Corps.
PUB DATE 76
CONTRACT 300-76-0034
NOTE 173p.; For related documents, see SP011 401-409 and SP011 542 ; Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$8.69 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; *Educational Change; *Organizational Change; *Organizational Effectiveness; *Performance Based Teacher Education; *Program Development; Teacher Certification
IDENTIFIERS *New York

ABSTRACT

This document examines common organizational change factors that were evident as teacher education institutions moved toward a performance based teacher education (PBTE) model of teacher certification pursuant to a New York State Department of Education mandate. Four questions were addressed: (1) What was the nature of the PBTE design process? (2) What organizational change variables facilitated the design of a PBTE program? (3) Are all consortia equal in their ability to design a PBTE program? and (4) What variables can be used as strategic manipulable levers in the design of PBTE programs? Policy boards, task forces, and institutions of higher education respondents completed questionnaires focusing on the design phase of program development and provided generally positive reactions to PBTE and their PBTE programs. Study findings indicate that PBTE programs may be more easily designed if the administrators of institutions of higher education work together to (1) set up communications networks between consortium design groups, (2) channel PBTE information exchange through the communication networks, (3) obtain design funds and materials to support the consortium's efforts, (4) set up an inservice training program to assist the consortium designers in developing the program, and (5) keep the policy board and task force groups informed of each others' design activities. (MJB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED143637

Factors Affecting The Institutional Development of CBTE Programs/vol.3

Organizational Change Process

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Nancy J. Howes

Teacher Education Developmental Service / John Ether, Director

Spring 1976

State University of New York at Albany

SP011 405

BEST COPY
AVAILABLE 2

ED143637

Preface

In July 1970, Teacher Corps requested all 5th cycle programs to begin developing Competence-Based Teacher Education programs. In July 1971, Teacher Corps required that all programs funded be competence-based. Since that time, Teacher Corps has been a major force in the development, demonstration and implementation of CBTE.

In 1972, the New York State Board of Regents set, as a goal, the establishment of teacher certification that ensures possession and maintenance of demonstrated competence on the part of teachers. The movement to CBTE in New York State should be completed by 1980.

These two facts come together quite naturally.

"What can be learned from the experiences in New York State as the transition is made? What help can be provided educational leaders in all other parts of the nation as a result of the New York State experience?"

We at the State University of New York at Albany were given the opportunity to attempt a response to those questions. An inter-disciplinary group of faculty and advanced graduate students in the School of Education accepted that responsibility. This volume is one of eight written as a result of that acceptance. Details are given in the Introduction that follows.

SP 011 405

Directing and coordinating this effort has been one of the most exciting experiences of my professional life. Acknowledgements are too extensive to attempt. Suffice it to say that cooperation of faculty, students, people from so many campuses in the State, our support staff, etc. was truly phenomenal.

One exception must be made. Without the herculean efforts and high level talent of Ms. Kathy Cooke, we would still be in formative stages.

It is our hope that we have, indeed, provided information to help educational leaders throughout the nation to judiciously consider CBTE and, if appropriate, to successfully implement that system.

John A. Ether
Professor of Education
Project Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. Introduction to the TEDS Research

Project.....1
History of CBTE in New York State.....2
Statement of the Problem.....3
Purpose.....5
Focus.....5
Population.....6
Sample.....6
Data Collection.....8
Summary.....8

II. Organizational Change Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs

Introduction.....9
Demographic Data On The Respondents.....13
Research Questions.....18
Summary and Conclusions of the Organizational Change Process.....73

Appendix A
Glossary of Terms

Appendix B
Responding Institutions
Number of Responses by Category
Chart - Responses per Institution by Role

Appendix C
Questionnaire

Appendix D
Mean Perceptions of Organizational Change
IHE Questionnaire
Policy Board Questionnaire
Task Force Questionnaire
Mean Group Perceptions of Organizational Change Variables
Across All Questionnaires

Appendix E
Respondent Perceptions of Organizational Change Variables
IHE
Policy Board
Task Force

Continued next page.....

Table of Contents ..... contd.

Appendix G
Principal Components Factor Analysis of Organizational Change Variables
IHE Respondents
Policy Board Respondents
Task Force Respondents

Appendix H
Stepwise Multiple Regression of the Organizational Change Variables as Predictors of Four Year Program Registration of CBTE
IHE Perceptions
Task Force Respondents
Policy Board Perceptions

This document consists of material prepared under Contract No. 300-76-0034, National Teacher Corps.

Introduction to the TEDS Research Project

In August 1975 the Teacher Education Developmental Service began a study designed to document the process of program development in teacher training institutions in New York State responding to a statewide mandate for Competence Based Teacher Education. This comprehensive study was completed in July 1976. The efforts of six professors and five research associates from various disciplines in the School of Education were combined to carry out the study. Six reports resulted from the study.

1. "Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs: A Descriptive and Summary Report of the Research."
2. "Process Environment Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs."
3. "Organizational Change Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs."
4. "Decision Making Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs.
5. "Leadership Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs."
6. "Technical Assistance Factors Affecting Institutional." Development of CBTE Programs.

HISTORY OF CBTE IN NEW YORK STATE

During the past forty years much change has taken place in the regulation of teacher preparation and certification practices in New York State. Mandatory requirement of a baccalaureate degree for most public school teachers was established in 1936. In 1943, the fifth year requirement was enacted for secondary and special certificates; in 1963 this was extended to elementary certificates. Certification has been granted by the State to students successfully completing an accredited academic program.

Recently the 1972 New York Board of Regents published "Education Beyond High School; the Regents Tentative Statewide Plan for the Development of Post-Secondary Education". That document cited changes in the economic, cultural and educational sectors of society that necessitated a re-evaluation of teacher preparation programs. The Regents goal for the preparation and practice of professional personnel in the school is:

> To establish a system of certification by which the State can assure the public that professional personnel in the school possess and maintain demonstrated competence to enable children to learn.

The Regents intended this goal to be implemented in Competency Based Teacher Education programs, with the state maintaining ultimate control through its program registration system.

Groundwork toward a competency-based teacher preparation program was laid in 1971 when 12 field-based trial projects dealing with program revision were sanctioned and supported by the New York State Department of Education. The projects included faculty and staff from public schools and colleges and teachers in training who identified school goals, relevant teacher competencies, evidence that such competencies are influentical and training programs to develop those competencies. These trial projects were continued and became models for the institutions now involved in re-writing teacher education programs in a competency-based mode. Other models, including the various Teacher Corps programs, were being developed and tested during the same period.

To implement the goal of state-wide competency based teacher education, a series of regional meetings were held in 1973, outlining new procedures and standards for state certification. A time line for program registration was established, beginning in 1976 for certain elementary certifications, concluding in 1980 with a competency based program for school administrators.

The first round of program submissions was completed in February, 1975. This research report concerns those institutions involved in meeting the February, 1975 deadline.

Statement of the Problem:

What are the processess involved in institutions of higher education and their consortia as they responed to a New York State mandate for CBTE?

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to: 1) identify, 2) describe, and 3) compare the characteristics (elements or factors) of the process of designing CBTE program proposals in various institutions in New York State as they responded to a state-wide mandate for CBTE.

Focus

The study focused upon those institutions which:

1) were to submit teacher training program proposals to the State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification on or before February 1, 1975. These include programs for the preparation of teachers in the following subject areas:

   a. N-6
   b. Special Education
   c. 7-9
   d. Speech-Hearing
   e. Deaf
   f. Blind

2) received one-year and/or four-year registration of their program proposals from the State Education Dept., division of Teacher Education and certification,

3) met the creteria set by the researchers regarding institutions, and whether or not they were public or private institutions containing appropriate programs, and,

4) indicated a willingness to participate in the study by allowing administration of questionnaires. It should be noted that the state mandate places Responsibility for program design upon the institutions of higher education. However, the mandate also requires that the institutions design the programs by collaborating with school district personnel and personnel from appropriate professional agencies. This collabortive group is known as the consortium and becomes the focal point for data collection in the study. The consortium also included sub groupings termed the Policy Board and Task Force whose behavior and involvement in the process will be analyzed.

The February, 1975 deadline for programs in elementary education, special education of the deaf and blind, and speech-hearing education marked the first mandate change toward Competency-Based Teacher Training in New York State. One hundred and forty-three teacher training programs in sixty institutions were required to respond to this deadline by submitting teacher training programs for program registration to the State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification. Due to the wide variety of institutional settings and characteristics represented by this group of teacher training institutions, responses to the state mandate took varying forms. Despite these differences in institutional settings and characteristics, the Division of Teacher Education and Certification was confronted with the problem of applying and developing standardized criteria upon which to base decisions regarding program registration. It is from these two phenomona; 1) the variations in institutional setting and characteristics, and; 2) the Division's state-wide mandate and standardized criteria for program development and registration, that the problem which this study addresses eminates.

This study concerns itself with the first part of the problem: the process of developing CBTE programs in sixty institutions in New York State with varying institutional settings and differing organizational, social, and physical characteristics.

Population

The population for this study consisted of those institutions which were required to submit CBTE program proposals to the State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification on or before February 1, 1975. Sixty institutions fell into this category encompassing one hundred forty-six teacher training programs. These programs proposed to train elementary school teachers in the following areas:

1. N-6 (81)
2. Speech Hearing (25)
3. 7-9 (6)
4. Deaf (3)
5. Blind (1)
6. SpecialEducation (30)

146

Sample

The researchers assumed that factors of institutional size and whether or not institutions were publicly or privately funded could provide a basis for comparison. Also, two categories were formed on the basis of whether or not institutions received one year or four year registration from the SED. Comparisons are made on the basis of these categories of analysis in each report. The categories formed on the basis of these criteria (size, funding, and registration) follow:

One year registration

Large public	4
Large private	4
small	4

Four year registration

Large public	4
Large private	4
Small	4

There was an insufficient number of small institutions to categorize them into private or public categories. One category had only four institutions and therefore the decision was made to place four institutions in each category to insure a balanced response from all categories. Initially, institutions to be placed in the remaining categories were chosen to insure the widest possible geographical dispersion throughout the state. Some institutions declined participation in the study. Back-up institutions were also selected on the basis of geographical dispersion and availabliilty.

An additional categroy of institutions was constructed from institutions which submitted two programs which received differing program registration (1 year or 4 year). This was done to provide a comparison of one and four year program development within institutions. This categroy was divided into public and private institutions.

One and four year registration

Public	(4)
Private	(4)

As a result of these categories and the necessity to place four institutions in each category thirty two institutions comprised the sample.

Eighteen of the 32 institutions responded.

Eight individuals at each institutions were identified according to role. These roles were identified in order to allow for a representative sample of all groups involved in the development of the CBTE program. The individuals identified were as follows:

--School of Education Dean or Department Chairman
--Public School Principal on the Policy Board
--Public School Teacher on the Policy Board
--College Faculty Member on the Policy Board
--Task Force Chairman
--Task Force Member from public school
--Task Force Member from college faculty
--Chairman of Policy Board

Each individual described above was given one questionnaire specifically disigned for his role. (For further information see Appendix B)

Data Collection

Due to the complex nature of the data the difficulties in the logistics of data collection, the decision was made to collect data through a questionnaire. Whenever possible (twenty seven of the thirty two institutions) the questionnaire was administered by one of the researchers at a meeting of the individuals filling out the questionnaire. The data gathered was either brought back by the researcher or mailed in by the respondents. Thus, the majority of the data was collected through on-site visitations.

Summary

The information presented in this section of the report is provided to introduce and explain the context and conduct of the comprehensive study. More specific information regarding the entire study is available in Report #1, "Factors Affecting Institutional Development of CBTE Programs: A Descriptive and Summary Report of the Research."

ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE FACTORS AFFECTING INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF CBTE PROGRAMS

INTRODUCTION

Over the years, educational organizations have tried to respond to changing student needs and societal requirements by altering their organizational structure, curriculum content, or teaching attitudes, behaviors or methods. Despite their attempts, however, relatively few of these organizations have been successful in institutionalizing the desired changes.

Why don't we now know more about changing? Change theorists, organizational development specialists, and educational researchers have studied the art and science of changing for years. Many variables related to the successful institutionalization of change have been identified and analyzed. Still, though, educational practitioners don't know how to implement innovations.

Bennis (1965)[1] believed that the present change theories fail to provide a theory of changing because they tended to "explain the dynamic interaction of a system without providing one clue to the identification of strategic leverages for

---

[1]Warren G. Bennis, "Theory and Method in Applying Behavioral Science to Planned Organizational Change," Applied Behavioral Science, Volume I, Number 4 (1965), p. 340.

alteration" of the change process. Chin (1961)[2] believed that different users needed to have different procedures for affecting change, and, that the selection of a procedural strategy ought to depend on the nature of the change, and the process of changing. Schmuck and Miles (1972)[3] believed that school improvement efforts failed because they were piecemeal and did not focus on the systematic features of schools which either enhanced or retarded innovation.

If CBTE, as a change in teacher training programs, is to be successfully implemented, more needs to be known about its change effort. In this study, the design phase, the first phase in a change effort, was focused on. In many respects, success in this phase is crucial; for, if CBTE programs are well designed, they are likely to be successfully institutionalized (the last phase in a change effort).

What was the nature of the CBTE design process followed by those consortia in New York who worked to develop CBTE programs in 1975-1976? What organizational change variables facilitated the design of a CBTE program? Are all consortia equal in their ability to design a CBTE program without too much effort? What variables can be used as strategic, manipulable levers in the design of CBTE programs?

---

[2]Robert Chin, "Basic Strategies and Procedures in Effecting Change," Planning and Effecting Needed Changes in Education, ed. Edgar L. Morphet and Charles O. Ryan (New York: Citation Press, 1961), p.53.

[3]Arthur Blumberg, "The School Organization as the Target of Change," Educational Technology, XII, Number 10 (October 1972), p.9.

To obtain answers to these questions, the following research questions were developed:

1. What is the nature of each individual designer's perception (within and across the institution of higher education (IHE), policy board and task force) of CBTE and the designed CBTE program?

2. What is the nature of the process followed by the IHE, policy board and task force groups in designing a CBTE plan?

3. What is the nature of the formal organizational structure of the IHE, policy board and task force groups?

4. What is the nature of the informal organizational environment of the IHE, policy board and task force groups?

5. What are the areas of similarity or dissimilarity in the identified change process (as viewed in questions one through four above) of the IHE policy board and task force when the perceptions of the respondents are analyzed across the varied IHE descriptors of IHE size and type, program registration, respondent group and program type?

6. What is the relationship, if any, between the varied elements of organizational change?

7. What is the set of organizational change variables which most strongly relate to a CBTE design program being accepted for a four rather than a one year period?

To gather data about the organizational change characteristics of the consortia and their sub-units, three descriptive survey questionnaires were developed. A different questionnaire was given to members of the IHE, policy board and task force groups because each group assumed a different role in the design effort.

The number of questions on the questionnaires ranged from 49 for the IHE respondents, 59 for policy board respondents, to 67 for task force respondents. For all the questions, the

respondents were asked to indicate the degree to which they agreed or disagreed (on a five point Likert scale where 1 = strongly agree and 5 = strongly disagree) with the change process statements. Each of these questionnaires is presented in Appendix C.

To analyze data to address the research questions, four basic analyses were performed. First, the frequency and corresponding percent of response choices and group means were computed for each questionnaire item. Second, a one way analysis of variance was run on the different group means to describe the degree of similarity or dissimilarity in perceptions across the varied IHE descriptors. Third, a factor analysis with varimax rotation (principle components analysis) was used to identify what relationships, if any, existed between the organizational change variables. Fourth, a multiple regression (with cut-off points at $\pm$ .1) was used to identify the set of variables which most strongly related to four year program registration.

The format for this report is divided into nine sections. In the next section, the demographic data on the organizational change respondents will be presented. Then, in the next seven sections, the basic research questions will be addressed. Finally, the overall characteristics of the CBTE design process will be summarized and analyzed.

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA ON THE RESPONDENTS

Table 1 presents demographic data on the organizational change respondents. Its six sections present information on the number of respondents by CBTE design role, by type of IHE, by type of program, and by group membership.

Altogether, 60 respondents from 18 institutions supplied useable data for this report. With the exception of the college faculty task force member category, for which there was no respondents, the respondents were fairly evenly distributed across the seven design roles. Section A of Table 1 provides a more complete description of this information.

The number of respondents by type of program registration was also fairly evenly divided. (See Section B of Table 1.) Twenty-nine respondents (48%) were members of a consortium which received one year program registration and 31 respondents (52%) were members of one which received four year registration.

The number of respondents by type of IHE was not evenly distributed, although it reflected the relative ratio of private to public colleges/universities in New York State. (See Section C of Table 1.) In this, twelve (20%) of the respondents worked with public IHEs and 48 (80%) worked with private IHEs.

The number of respondents by size of IHE also reflected the ratio of large to small schools of education in New York State. (See Section D of Table 1.) Here, 42 (70%) of the respondents worked with large IHEs (100 or more students in the school of education) and 18 (30%) of the respondents worked with small IHEs (less than 100 students in the school of education).

The number of respondents by type of program related to the number of those teacher training programs which were traditionally developed in New York State. (See Section E of Table 1.) Here 52 (87%) of the respondents worked in consortia which designed an elementary program, two (3%) worked in consortia which designed a speech program, one (2%) worked in a consortium which designed a special education program, and five (8%) worked in consortia which designed other (i.e. secondary, art, etc.) programs.

The number of respondents by group membership (see Section F of Table 1), represented the number of individuals responding to each organizational change questionnaire. In this, 19 individuals (32%) responded to the IHE questionnaire, 25 (42%) to the policy board questionnaire and 16 (27%) to the task force questionnaire.

TABLE 1

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA ABOUT ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE RESPONDENTS

A. Number of Respondents by CBTE Design Roles

ROLES	Frequency/Percent IHE*	Task Force	Policy Board	TOTAL: f/%
Dean of IHE*	3/15.8	-	1/4.0	4/6.7
Principal - Policy Board	-	-	10/40.0	10/16.7
Teacher - Policy Board	-	-	6/24.0	6/10.0
College Faculty - Policy Board	8/42.1	-	-	8/13.3
Chairperson - Task Force	1/5.3	-	6/24.0	7/11.7
Public School Staff - Task Force	-	8/50.0	1/4.0	9/15.0
College Faculty - Task Force	-	-	-	-
Chairperson - Policy Board	7/36.8	8/50.0	1/4.0	16/26.7
TOTALS	19	16	25	60

B. Number of Respondents by Type of Program Registration

PROGRAM REGISTRATION	Frequency/Percent IHE*	Task Force	Policy Board	TOTAL: f/%
One Year	9/47.4	7/43.8	13/52.0	29/48.3
Four Year	10/52.6	9/56.3	12/48.0	31/51.7
TOTALS	19	16	25	60

C. Number of Respondents by Type of IHE

IHE* Type	Frequency/Percent IHE*	Task Force	Policy Board	Totals: f/%
Public	6/31.6	3/18.8	3/12.0	12/20.0
Private	13/68.4	13/81.3	22/88.0	48/80.0
TOTALS	19	16	25	60

D. Number of Respondents by Size of IHE*

IHE* Size	Frequency/Percent IHE*	Task Force	Policy Board	Totals: f/%
Large	14/73.7	11/68.8	17/68.0	42/70.0
Small	5/26.3	5/31.3	8/32.0	18/30.0
TOTALS	19	16	25	60

E. Number of Respondents by Type of Program

Program Type	Frequency/Percent IHE*	Task Force	Policy Board	Totals: f/%
Elementary	16/84.2	15/93.8	21/84.0	52/86.7
Speech	1/5.3	-/-	1/4.0	2/3.3
Special	-/-	-/-	1/4.0	1/1.7
Other	2/10.5	1/6.3	2/8.0	5/8.3
TOTALS	19	25	25	60

F. Number of Respondents by Group Membership

GROUP MEMBERSHIP	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
IHE*	19	31.7
Task Force	16	26.7
Policy Board	25	41.7
TOTALS	60	100.1

* IHE = Institution of Higher Education

RESEARCH QUESTION 1

> What is the nature of each individual designer's perception (within and across the IHE, policy board and task force) of CBTE and the designed CBTE program?

To address this question, the frequency of response choices, the corresponding percents and the mean responses for each change statement were computed for each respondent group. Overall group means across all three respondent groups were not computed because the questionnaires for each group were too different for grouping the responses statistically. In order to report the trends in the groups' responses, however, those change statements which related to the same variable (or concept area) were categorized together for discussion purposes. For this question, the variables were organized in terms of the respondents' perceptions of CBTE and the designed CBTE program. Both of these areas will be discussed in greater detail in the following pages. Throughout these sections, the similarities in perception will be discussed first and the dissimilarities will be discussed last.

Appendix D presents the mean group response for each change statement and Appendix E presents the group's frequency and percents for each statement's response choice. Table 2 presents the three groups' mean responses for each of the reorganized statements.

TABLE 2

Mean Group Perceptions of Organizational Change Variables --- Across All Questionnaires

Leadership Category	Mean Group Perceptions		
	INE	Policy Board	Task Force
1. CBTE should provide sufficient teacher education information for teacher trainers.	2.053	1.440	1.563
2. I approve of CBTE.	2.000	1.920	1.812
3. Task force members were given a useful CBTE design inservice training program.	3.421	3.720	3.000
4. There were many rules and procedures describing our group's CBTE design role*	-	3.280	3.458
5. Members of our group were able to influence the consortium's educational policies/decisions.	-	2.040	2.062
6. Our group's leader was concerned with what I thought about CBTE*	-	1.760	2.062
7. CBTE is a more rational and systematic method for training teachers.	2.421	2.280	2.125
8. INE administrators approve of CBTE.	2.000	1.960	2.062
9. Sufficient CBTE design assistance was given to the task force.	2.947	2.280	2.250
10. The State Education Department set up many CBTE design rules and procedures.	3.474	3.480	3.687
11. I was able to influence our group's educational policies/decisions.*	2.421	2.040	2.375
12. Our group leader supported my CBTE design efforts.*	-	1.840	1.937
13. Our group leader approves of CBTE.*	2.053	1.840	2.125
14. Our group was given an orientation session which helped me understand the CBTE design requirements.*	2.579	2.680	2.437
15. I had to communicate with the other members of my group to design a CBTE plan.*	-	2.320	2.062
16. I was able to influence the policy board's educational policies/ decisions.	2.421	-	2.500
17. Our group leader spent adequate CBTE design time with me.*	-	2.560	2.000
18. CBTE is a more accountable method for training teachers.	2.263	1.880	1.937
19. Our group's members approve of CBTE.*	2.421	1.920	2.312
20. Sufficient CBTE design funds were made available to the consortium.	4.263	3.800	3.750
21. I had to communicate with our group's leader to design a CBTE plan.*	-	2.520	2.312

TABLE 2 - continued

Leadership Category	Mean Group Perceptions		
	IHE	Policy Board	Task Force
22. I was able to influence the design of the CBTE plan.	2.263	1.960	2.312
23. Our group leader provided CBTE design information.*	-	2.400	2.437
24. CBTE should lead to more effective teacher preparation.	2.316	2.040	1.812
25. Consortium school district administrators approve of CBTE.	2.632	1.880	2.188
26. I received feedback from others in regard to my CBTE design performance/role.	2.526	2.520	2.437
27. I had to communicate with IHE administrators to design a CBTE plan.	-	-	2.813
28. I liked to work with our group's members.*	-	1.760	1.937
29. Our group leader provided me with the necessary kinds of CBTE design assistance.*	-	2.360	2.125
30. CBTE should lead to more effective teacher performance.	2.368	2.080	1.875
31. Consortium school teachers unions approve of CBTE.	3.421	2.720	2.062
32. I received feedback from my own administrative superior in regard to my CBTE design performance/role.	2.684	2.840	2.562
33. I had to communicate with policy board members to design a CBTE plan.	-	-	2.687
34. Communication among our group's members focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.*	-	2.280	1.937
35. IHE administrators were concerned with what the task force thought about CBTE.	-	-	2.375
36. CBTE should ultimately lead to more effective student school performance.	2.474	2.320	1.937
37. The initial results of CBTE in teacher preparation in other states have been positive.	3.474	3.040	3.125
38. Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by task force members only.	3.421	3.240	3.062
39. I had little freedom to control the CBTE design events.	3.000	4.040	3.875
40. Communication between the task force and the policy board focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.	2.842	2.120	2.312
41. IHE administrators supported the task force's CBTE design efforts.	-	-	2.062
42. Our CBTE plan should lead to more effective teacher performance.	2.263	2.320	1.812

TABLE 2 - continued

Leadership Category	Mean Group Perceptions		
	IHE	Policy Board	Task Force
43. CBTE's principles and components are difficult to understand.	3.158	3.760	3.250
44. Decisions about designing the CBTE plan were made by task force members only.	3.684	3.560	3.625
45. I was allowed little initiative in designing a CBTE plan.	4.316	4.160	4.312
46. IHE administrators spent adequate CBTE design time with the task force.	-	-	2.813
47. Our CBTE plan should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.	2.421	2.160	1.875
48. It took too much time to design a CBTE plan.	2.947	3.440	3.562
49. Decisions about designing the CBTE plan were made by personnel outside the task force.	3.105	3.560	3.687
50. There were conflicting expectations held about my (or my group's) CBTE design role.*	3.632	3.560	3.125
51. I was held accountable for my CBTE design role.	2.474	2.720	2.125
52. Communication between the task force and the IHE administrators focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.	2.263	2.640	2.750
53. IHE administrators provided CBTE design information.	2.895	2.520	3.125
54. Our CBTE plan should provide sufficient teacher education information for teacher trainers.	2.053	2.080	1.875
55. It was easy to design a CBTE plan.	4.158	3.880	4.125
56. Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by personnel outside the task force.	3.316	3.480	3.250
57. I received adequate compensation from my own organization for my CBTE design role.	3.789	3.640	3.625
58. I was adequately involved in designing a CBTE plan.	1.895	1.680	2.437
59. IHE administrators provided the task force with the necessary kinds of CBTE design assistance.	-	-	2.875
60. Our CBTE plan should set up a more rational, systematic method for training teachers.	2.526	2.040	2.500
61. When CBTE details were first presented to me (or my group), its objectives were clearly defined.	3.211	2.840	3.000

TABLE 2 - continued

Leadership Category	Mean Group Perceptions IHE	Policy Board	Task Force
62. I participated to the extent that I desired in making CBTE design decisions.	2.105	1.680	2.312
63. When CBTE details were first presented to me (or my group) research findings about its effects in training teachers were not mentioned.	2.263	2.800	2.562
64. Our group was not well kept informed on the CBTE design decisions and actions taken by the other group.	3.789	4.080	3.438
65. Necessary CBTE design materials and supplies were not provided on time.	3.368	3.800	3.625
66. Procedures for setting up a CBTE plan were clearly defined by the policy board.	2.737	-	2.625
67. Task force meetings were scheduled when problems were encountered in designing a CBTE plan.	-	2.200	2.437

TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS = 61

* Our group's (decisions, etc.) = IHE -- Task Force
Policy Board -- Policy Board
Task Force -- Task Force

Response Key: 1 = strongly agree
2 = agree
3 = neither agree nor disagree
4 = disagree
5 = strongly disagree

Respondents' Perception of CBTE

The data to describe this change element was obtained by viewing each group's frequency and percent distribution of response choices to seven recategorized items - 1,7,18,24,30,36 and 37 (see Appendix E). The varying group means for each item were used to supplement this information (see Table 2). The seven items were defined by the degree to which the respondents' believed that CBTE:

a. should provide sufficient teacher education information;

b. was a more rational, systematic teacher training method than present methods;

c. was a more accountable teacher training method than present methods;

d. should lead to more effective teacher preparation;

e. should lead to more effective teacher performance;

f. should lead to more effective student performance; and

g. showed positive teacher training results in other states.

Across all three groups (IHE, policy board and task force), the respondents were generally consistent in the way they viewed CBTE. Most of the respondents viewed CBTE positively as an effective teacher training method. The mean responses of each group reflected this consistency. With the exception of one statement, for which there was little agreement, the groups' mean responses ranged from 1.440 to 2.474 (where 1= strongly agree and 5 = strongly disagree) for each statement.

For four of the items, two-thirds or more of all the respondents in each group were positive (e.g. strongly agreed or agreed to CBTE statement) about CBTE. Sixty-eight percent of the IHE respondents, 92 percent of the policy board (hereafter abbreviated PB) respondents, and 81 percent of the task force (hereafter abbreviated TF) respondents strongly agreed or agreed that CBTE should provide sufficient teacher training information for decisionmakers. In addition, 53 percent of the IHE respondents, 76 percent of the PB respondents and 81 percent of the TF respondents strongly agreed or agreed that CBTE was a more accountable teacher training method than present methods. Furthermore, 58 percent of the IHE, 68 percent of the PB and 88 percent of the TF respondents strongly agreed or agreed that CBTE should lead to more effective teacher preparation. And, 58 percent of the IHE, 76 percent of the PB and 88 percent of the TF respondents strongly agreed or agreed that CBTE should lead to more effective teacher performance.

For two items, however, only a majority of the respondents were positive about CBTE. Only 47 percent of the IHE respondents, 64 percent of the PB respondents and 75 percent of the TF respondents strongly agreed or agreed that CBTE was a more rational, systematic teacher training method than present methods. Also, only 53 percent of the IHE, 64 percent of the PB and 75 percent of the TF respondents strongly agreed or agreed that CBTE should lead to more effective student performance.

Finally, for one item, less than one-third of the respondents were positive. None of the IHE respondents and 30

percent of the PB and 31 percent of the TF respondents strongly agreed or agreed that CBTE had shown positive teacher training results in other states. In this situation, most of the respondents neither agreed nor disagreed to this statement; 68 percent of the IHE, 60 percent of the PB and 44 percent of the TF respondents were unsure about the effects of CBTE in other states.

Despite this consistency in the trend of the respondents' perceptions across the groups, there were observable differences among the groups in terms of the numbers and percent of respondents in each group who strongly agreed or agreed to the change statements. For all seven items, more of the task force and policy board respondents were positive about CBTE than were the IHE respondents. For example, across these items the average percent of IHE respondents agreeing to the change statements was only 48 percent, while the average of PB and TF respondents doing likewise was 66 and 74 percent respectively. Furthermore, the mean response for IHE respondents was 2.48 while the mean response for PB and TF respondents was 2.15 and 2.06 respectively.

Respondents' Perceptions of CBTE Program Design

The data to describe this change element was obtained by viewing each group's frequency and percent distribution and mean response to four reorganized items - 42, 47, 54 and 60 (see Table 2 and Appendix E). These four items were defined by the degree to which the respondents' believed that their CBTE program:

a. should lead to more effective teacher performance;

b. should lead to more effective teacher preparation;

c. should provide sufficient teacher education information; and,

d. should set up a more rational, systematic teacher training method than present methods.

Across all three respondent groups, respondents' perceptions about their own CBTE programs were also fairly consistent and favorable. For three items relating to CBTE as a teacher training program, the groups' mean responses ranged from 1.812 to 2.421, and for the fourth item (CBTE program viewed as a systematic method) the groups' mean responses ranged from 2.040 to 2.526.

For the first three items, two thirds or more of all the respondents viewed collectively were positive about their own CBTE programs. Fifty-three percent of the IHE, 72 percent of the PB and 88 percent of the TF respondents strongly agreed or agreed that their CBTE programs should lead to more effective teacher performance. In addition, 53 percent of the IHE, 92 percent of the PB and 88 percent of the TF respondents strongly agreed or agreed that their CBTE programs should lead to more effective teacher preparation. And, 68 percent of the IHE, 76 percent of the PB and 81 percent of the TF respondents strongly agreed or agreed that their programs shold provide sufficient teacher education information.

For one item, less than two-thirds of the respondents were positive about their programs. Only 47 percent of the IHE, 60 percent of the PB and 44 percent of the TF respondents strongly agreed or agreed that their programs should set up a more rational,

systematic teacher training method than present programs.

Despite this consistency in the trend of respondents' perceptions across the group, there were observable differences among the IHE, PB and TF respondents. Across the four items, more of the policy board and task force respondents strongly agreed or agreed to the statements than did the IHE respondents. Across these items, the average percent of IHE respondents agreeing to the statements was 55 percent, while the average of PB and TF respondents doing so was 75 percent for each group. Furthermore, the mean response for this category for IHE respondents was 2.316, while the mean response for PB and TF respondents was 2.150 and 2.016 respectively.

Summary of CBTE Perceptions

Most of the respondents in each group were positive about CBTE and their CBTE programs. More than two-thirds of the IHE, PB and TF respondents believed that CBTE and their own CBTE programs should provide sufficient teacher training information and should lead to more effective teacher preparation and performance. The majority of them also believed that CBTE was a more accountable method, should lead to more effective student performance and was a more systematic method than the methods used presently. Few of the respondents (less than 31 percent) believed that positive CBTE results were identified in other states.

More of the PB and TF respondents were positive about CBTE and their CBTE program than were the IHE respondents. Across all eleven items, the average percent of IHE respondents agreeing

to these statements was 51 percent, while the average of PB and TF respondents doing so was 69 and 74 percent respectively.

RESEARCH QUESTION 2

What were the characteristics of the process followed by the IHE, policy board and task force groups in designing a CBTE plan in terms of:

a. communications networks set up within and across groups;
b. logistical support provided to each group;
c. feedback networks set up and used within and across groups;
d. decision making process followed by each group;
e. roles assumed by group leaders and IHE administrators; and
f. planned change strategies observed in design effort.

To address this question, the same procedures as those used for question 1 were followed. As before, Appendix D and E and Table 2 present the data which was used in responding to the question. Each of the six description of the change process described above will be discussed in detail in the following pages.

Communication Networks

The data to describe this change element was obtained by viewing each group's responses to up to seven recategorized items - 15, 21, 27, 33, 34, 40 and 52 (see Appendix E and Table 2). Groups were not compared on all items because each group responded to a different number of statements; the task force to seven, the policy board to five and the IHE to two. The seven items were defined by the degree to which the respondents believed that:

a. the individual respondent had to communicate with others in his/her group;

b. the individual respondent had to communicate with his/her group leader;

c. the individual respondent had to communicate with IHE administrators;

d. the individual respondent had to communicate with policy group members;

e. group communication focused on information exchange; and

f. communication between design groups focused on information exchange.

In general, the respondents indicated that the communication networks within and across the different design groups were being used to some degree and that some information was being channeled through them. The groups were varied, however, in their views about any one item. Mean scores across the items ranged from 1.937 to 2.842, with about this much group variation for any one item.

In terms of using communication channels, 75 percent of the TF and 64 percent of the PB respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they had to communicate with others in their groups to design the CBTE program. Also, 56 percent of the TF strongly agreed or agreed that they had to communicate with policy board members to design the CBTE program.

In terms of information exchange, 75 percent of the TF and 64 percent of the PB strongly agreed or agreed that their own group's communication focused on CBTE information exchange. And, 63 percent of the TF and 60 percent of the PB strongly agreed or agreed that the policy board and task force communication

focused on CBTE information exchange. This last perception was challenged by IHE respondents, however, for only 32 percent of them agreed that the policy board and task force communication focused on this exchange.

There was less agreement between the groups, however, when the communication network between group members and group leaders or IHE administrators was discussed. In the former case, 69 percent of the TF but only 36 percent of the PB strongly agreed or agreed that their group members had to communicate with their group leader. In the latter case, only 50 percent of the TF strongly agreed or agreed that their group members had to communicate with the IHE administrators. Furthermore, only 44 percent of the TF and 40 percent of the PB strongly agreed or agreed that communication between their group and IHE administrators focused on CBTE information exchange. This perception was not shared by the IHE respondents, however, 58 percent of them strongly agreed or agreed that the communication between IHE administrators and other design groups focused on CBTE information exchange.

Unlike many of the other change elements, the differences in group's perceptions about the communication networks were quite pronounced. The TF and PB sharply differed in terms of their perception about communication with their leaders, and the TF, PB and IHE differed in terms of their perceptions about information exchange between the groups and IHE administrators. In the first situation, while 69 percent of the TF respondents agreed that they communicated with their leaders, 60 percent of the PB

respondents were unsure as to whether they did or did not. In the second situation, while most of the TF and PB respondents (more than 60 percent) believed that communication between them focused on information exchange, 42 percent of the IHE respondents were unsure of this and 26 percent disagreed with this. In the final situation, 58 percent of the IHE respondents believed that communication with IHE administrators focused on information exchange, while 48 percent of the PB and 38 percent of the TF were unsure.

Logistical Support

The data to describe this element of the CBTE design process was obtained from four reorganized items - 3,9,14 and 20 (see Table 2 and Appendix E). Logistical support was defined by the degree to which the respondents believed that:

a. the task force was given a useful CBTE design inservice training program;

b. the task force was given sufficient CBTE design assistance;

c. they were given a useful CBTE orientation session to help them understand the program; and,

d. the consortium was given sufficient CBTE design funds.

Across the three groups, respondents tended to be more negative than positive about the utility of the logistical support received by the design groups. The mean scores of the groups (2.859 for TF, 3.120 for PB and 3.303 for IHE respondents) reflect this less positive trend.

In terms of receiving a useful inservice program, only 21 percent of the IHE, 16 percent of the PB and 38 percent of the TF respondents believed that the task force had received a useful inservice training program to help them design a CBTE program; while 42 percent of the IHE, 60 percent of the PB and 25 percent of the TF respondents believed that the task force had not received a useful inservice training program. In addition, 37 percent of the IHE, 24 percent of the PB and 38 percent of the TF replied that they had received no inservice training at all.

On a more positive vein, two of the three groups agreed (64 percent of the PB and 69 percent of the TF) that the task force had received sufficient CBTE design assistance. One group, however, the IHE respondents, were less sure that this was the case. For this group, 32 percent agreed, while 42 percent were not sure.

In terms of the group's perceptions about receiving an orientation session, respondents were a bit more positive; 63 percent of the TF, 44 percent of the PB and 47 percent of the IHE group members believed that they had been given a useful orientation program. This was not the case for all the respondents however, for 37 percent of the IHE, 36 percent of the PB and 25 percent of the TF replied that they had received no CBTE orientation session at all.

In terms of the group's perception about receiving sufficien design funds, all three groups agreed that they did not receive sufficient design funds. In fact, 72 percent of the IHE,

68 percent of the PB and 50 percent of the TF respondents believed that they had not received sufficient design funds. Furthermore, 38 percent of the TF respondents replied that they had not received any design funds at all.

Despite the general consistency in respondents' perceptions, there were some differences among the groups. In most situations, task force respondents were more positive about the logistical assistance they received than the other groups. In fact, 45 percent of the task force respondents were positive about their assistance, while only 37 percent of the PB and 28 percent of the IHE were positive about theirs.

Feedback Networks

The data to describe this process element was obtained by viewing each groups' responses to three items - 26,32 and 64 (see Table 2 and Appendix E). The three items were defined by the degree to which the respondents believed that:

a. they received feedback from others in regard to their CBTE design role;

b. they received feedback from their own administrative superior in regard to their CBTE design role; and

c. their group was not kept informed on the decisions and actions taken by other design groups.

In general, the groups were in strong agreement on this element. A simple majority of the respondents (reflected by mean score of 2.520 for TF, 2.427 for PB and 2.474 for IHE respondents) agreed that they received performance feedback and that their group received feedback on other groups' design activities.

In terms of individual performance feedback, a little more than 50 percent of the respondents believed that they received performance feedback from others and a little less than 50 percent believed that they received feedback from their own administrative leaders. In both these items, however, a number of respondents (between 15 and 21 percent of the IHE, 24 and 28 percent of the PB and 31 and 38 percent of the TF respondents) believed that they received no feedback from others.

In terms of groups being kept informed of other group's design activities, again, a little more than 50 percent of the respondents believed that their group was kept informed of the design activities of others. Only 11 percent of the IHE, four percent of the PB and six percent of the TF respondents believed that their group was not kept informed; while 63 percent of the IHE, 72 percent of the PB and 38 percent of the TF respondents believed that their groups were kept informed.

Overall, there were few differences between the groups in the way that they viewed their feedback networks. The mean scores for the group ranged from 2.520 for the TF, 2.427 for the PB and 2.474 for the IHE respondents.

Decision Making Process

The data to describe this process element was obtained by viewing each group's responses to four reorganized items - 38, 44, 49 and 56 (see Table 2 and Appendix E). The items related to the degree to which the respondents believed that:

a. CBTE content decisions were made by task force members only;

b. CBTE design decisions were made by task force members only;

c. CBTE design decisions were made by personnel other than those in the task force; and,

d. CBTE content decisions were made by personnel other than those in the task force.

In general, there were more respondents in the three groups who disagreed with than agreed to these statements. From the opposing responses, it appeared that no one group (task force or other design group) alone was perceived as making content or process decisions on designing CBTE. The mean score for these groups reflected this finding; the item means ranged from 3.062 to 3.687 for the TF, from 3.240 to 3.560 for the PB and from 3.105 to 3.684 for the IHE respondents. In addition, the average percent of respondents agreeing to these statements ranged from 24 percent for PB and TF to 30 percent for the IHE respondents.

In terms of CBTE content decisions, only 26 percent of the IHE, 40 percent of the PB and 38 percent of the TF respondents agreed that it was the task force members only who made these decisions. In turn, only 32 percent of the IHE, 12 percent of the PB and 25 percent of the TF respondents agreed that content decisions were made by personnel other than those in the task force. In contrast, 58 percent of the IHE, 48 percent of the PB and 44 percent of the TF respondents disagreed that task force members only made content decisions and 47 percent of the IHE, 52 percent of the PB and 44 percent of the TF

respondents disagreed that only personnel outside the task force made content decisions.

There were slight differences between the groups on the way they viewed the decision making process. More TF and PB than IHE respondents believed that decisions were made by the task force only and more IHE than TF and PB respondents believed that decisions were made by personnel other than those in the task force. In terms of decisions made by the task only, 28 percent of the TF and 30 percent of the PB respondents believed that content and design decisions were made by the task force only, while 24 percent of the IHE respondents believed this to be the case. In terms of decisions made by personnel outside the task force, 37 percent of the IHE respondents believed that content and design decisions were made by personnel outside the task force, while 19 percent of the TF and 18 percent of the PB believed this to be the case.

Leadership Roles

The data to describe the leadership roles of the varied group leaders and IHE administrators was obtained by viewing each group's response to up to ten reorganized items - 6,12, 17,23,25,35,41,46,53 and 59 (see Table 2 and Appendix E). As before, group responses were not compared across the items, because each group responded to a different set of statements. The task force responded to ten statements about the task force leader and IHE administrators; the policy board to six (five about the policy board leader and one about the IHE administrators); and, the IHE to one statement about the IHE

administrators. The ten items were defined by the degree to which the respondents believed that their group leader and/or IHE administrators:

a. were concerned with what they thought about CBTE;

b. supported their design efforts;

c. spent adequate design time with them;

d. provided them with CBTE design information; and,

e. provided them with the necessary kinds of design assistance.

In general, the TF and PB respondents were positive about the leadership roles assumed by the task force or policy board leaders. Sixty-eight percent of the TF (with a mean score of 2.087) and 62 percent of the PB (with a mean score of 2.18) respondents believed that their task force or policy board leaders psychologically or logistically supported their efforts. The TF respondents were less positive about the role assumed by the IHE administrators. Only 51 percent of the TF (with a mean score of 2.650) believed that the IHE administrators supported their efforts, while 32 percent were unsure and 17 percent believed that they did not. The PB and IHE respondents did not respond to enough items about the IHE administrators to compare their responses with those of the TF respondents.

In terms of the role assumed by the task force leaders, 75 percent of the TF respondents believed that the TF leaders were concerned with what they (the respondents) thought about CBTE; 88 percent believed that the TF leaders supported their design efforts; 69 percent believed that they spent adequate

design time with them; 44 percent that they provided them with CBTE design information; and, 63 percent that they provided them with the necessary kinds of design assistance. In only one situation, providing the TF respondents with CBTE information, did less than 60 percent of the respondents believe the leader to be supporting their efforts. In this case, 56 percent were unsure whether this was required of the leader at all.

In terms of the role assumed by the policy board leaders, 80 percent of the PB respondents believed that the PB leaders were concerned with what they (the respondents) thought about CBTE; 72 percent believed that the PB leaders supported their design efforts; 40 percent believed that they spent adequate design time with them; 56 percent that they provided them with CBTE design information; and, 60 percent that they provided them with the necessary kinds of assistance. In two situations, more than 20 percent of the respondents questioned whether the leader supported their design effort. In the case of the leader spending adequate design time with PB members, 44 percent of the PB respondents were not sure. And, in the case of the leader providing design information, 24 percent questioned whether this was required of the leader at all.

In terms of the role assumed by the IHE administrators, 56 percent of the TF respondents believed that the IHE administrators were concerned with what they (the respondents) thought about CBTE; 81 percent believed that the IHE administrators supported their design efforts; 44 percent believed that they spent adequate design time with them; and, 25 percent

believed that they provided them with the necessary kinds of design assistance. In terms of the IHE administrators providing the respondents with CBTE design information (the one item in which all respondents replied), 50 percent of the TF, 44 percent of the PB and 47 percent of the IHE respondents believed that IHE administrators provided CBTE design information. In three situations, less than 60 percent of the TF respondents were in agreement about the IHE administrators role. Thirty-one percent of the TF respondents were not sure whether the IHE administrators were concerned with their thoughts about CBTE; 38 percent were not sure whether the IHE administrators spent adequate time with them; and, 63 percent questioned whether the IHE administrators provided the task force with necessary design assistance. In terms of IHE administrators providing design information 38 percent of the TF, 12 percent of the PB and 32 percent of the IHE respondents believed that the administrators did not provide design information . Fourty-four percent of the PB respondents questioned whether this was their responsibility at all.

There were a few differences between the TF and PB in the ways they viewed their own leaders. Sixty-eight percent of the TF respondents viewed their leaders as positively supporting their efforts while only 62 percent of the PB respondents viewed their leaders as doing so. In other cases, there was not enough data to compare responses across groups.

Planned Change Characterisitics

The data to describe the planned change characteristics of the CBTE design process followed in each group was obtained by viewing each group's responses to nine or ten reorganized items - 43, 48, 55, 58, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66 and 67 (see Table 2 and Appendix E. Comparisons were made across every item, although the PB and IHE respondents only responded to nine of the ten items. The ten items were defined by the degree to which the respondents believed that:

a. the principles and components of CBTE were difficult to understand;

b. the design effort took too much time;

c. the design effort was easy;

d. they were adequately involved in designing the plan;

e. objectives of CBTE were clearly defined when CBTE details were first presented to the design groups;

f. they participated to the extent they desired in making CBTE design decisions;

g. research findings of CBTE were not mentioned when CBTE details were first presented to the design groups;

h. necessary CBTE materials and supplies were not provided on time;

i. CBTE design procedures were clearly defined by the policy board and,

j. group meetings were scheduled when CBTE design problems were encountered.

In general, respondents were mixed about the characteristics of the CBTE design effort which occurred in their groups. They were positive about the degree to which they were involved or participated in the process (mean score of 2.395 for TF, 1.853

38 percent of the TF, 60 percent of the PB and 58 percent of the IHE respondents believed that they were received on time. In the fourth case, none of the TF and only 12 percent of the PB and 11 percent of the IHE respondents believed that the design effort was easy, while 69 percent of the TF, 64 percent of the PB and 79 percent of the IHE respondents believed that it was difficult.

In terms of advance preparation for the design process, the respondents were mixed in their perceptions. Only 25 percent of the TF, 36 percent of the PB and 32 percent of the IHE respondents believed that the objectives of CBTE had been defined for them while 56 percent of the TF respondents were unsure and 32 percent of the PB and 47 percent of the respondents believed that they had not. In addition, 38 percent of the TF, 32 percent of the PB and 58 percent of the IHE respondents believed that the research findings of CBTE in other states had been identified, while 56 percent of the TF, 40 percent of the PB and 21 percent of the IHE respondents were unsure. And, finally 43 percent of the TF and 37 percent of the IHE respondents believed that the policy board clearly defined CBTE design procedures, while 38 percent of the TF and 37 percent of the IHE respondents were unsure.

In terms of the respondents' perceptions of involvement and participation in the design process, the respondents were mostly favorable. Fifty percent of the TF, 76 percent of the PB and 79 percent of the IHE respondents believed that they were adequately involved in designing

the CBTE program, and 56 percent of the TF, 80 percent of the PB and 79 percent of the IHE respondents believed that they participated to the extent they desired in making CBTE design decisions. In addition, most respondents were generally positive about whether group meetings were scheduled when CBTE design problems were encountered. In this situation, 50 percent of the TF and 60 percent of the PB believed that meetings were called when problems in designing CBTE occurred; while only 44 percent of the TF and 28 percent of the PB respondents were unsure whether this occurred.

There were a few differences among the group in their perceptions about the design process, advance preparation and degree of involvement/participation in the process. In the first case, more IHE (23 percent) than TF and PB respondents (10 and 15 percent respectively) were positive about the design process. In the second case, more IHE (42 percent) than PB and TF respondents (34 and 32 percent respectively) were positive about the advance preparation they received for designing the process. And, in the third case, more PB and IHE respondents (72 and 79 percent respectively) than TF respondents (52 percent) were positive about the degree to which they were involved in the design process.

Summary of the Design Process

The respondents perceptions about the design process were neither very positive nor very negative. Apparently, they encountered both positive and negative process characteristics.

A majority of the respondents (more than 50 percent) believed that the communication networks within and across groups were being used and that design information was being channeled through them. Although they were less positive about communicating with their leaders, particularly the policy board and IHE leaders, they still indicated that the leaders were involved in the design process.

Respondents were generally negative about the degree to which they were logistically supported, but they were slightly positive about the degree to which they were psychologically supported. Only 33 percent of the respondents believed that they had received a useful inservice training program, 60 percent believed that they had received a useful orientation program, and 25 percent believed that they had received sufficient design funds. Furthermore, 33 percent of the respondents believed that they had not received an orientation program at all, and 38 percent of the TF respondents believed that they had not received any design funds at all. A majority of respondents in only <u>one</u> situation, receiving sufficient psychological assistance, believed that they received sufficient assistance.

A majority of the respondents believed that the <u>individual</u> feedback networks were used and that they were kept appraised

for PB and 2.000 for IHE respondents), neutral about the degree of advance preparation they received to assist them in designing the programs (mean score of 2.729 for TF, 2.820 for PB and 2.666 for IHE respondents) and neutral about the process itself (mean score of 2.828 for TF, 3.280 for PB and 2.829 for IHE respondents).

In terms of the attributes of the process itself, the respondents were slightly neutral in their perception. Although less than one-third of the respondents believed the process took too much time and more than half believed CBTE was very easy to understand, and that supplies were received on time,more than two-thirds believed that it was not easy. In the first case, 25 percent of the TF, 28 percent of the PB and 32 percent of the IHE respondents believed that the design effort took too much time, while 56 percent of the TF, 52 percent of the PB and 32 percent of the IHE respondents believed that it did not.

In the second case, 50 percent of the TF, 72 percent of the PB and 53 percent of the IHE respondents believed that it was easy to understand the CBTE program. While 31 percent of the TF, 8 percent of the PB and 42 percent of the IHE respondents believed it was difficult to understand the program.

In the third case, respondents believed that supplies and materials were received on time. Only six percent of TF, four percent of the PB and 26 percent of the IHE respondents believed that needed supplies/materials were not received on time, while

of their performance. Only a few respondents (less than ten percent), however, believed that the group feedback networks were used and that they were kept informed of other group's activities.

No one group alone was seen as making CBTE content or process decisions. The respondents were divided as to whether they perceived decisions to be made by task force members only, non task force members only, or others. Apparently, decisions were reached by all of the design groups.

In general, the TF and PB respondents were positive about the leadership roles assumed by the task force and policy board leaders and rather negative about the leadership roles asseumed by the IHE administrators. More than 60 percent of the TF and PB respondents believed their own group's leader psychologically or logistically supported them, while less than 40 percent of all three groups believed that the IHE administrators supported their efforts.

In general, respondents were mixed about the characteristics of the CBTE design effort which occurred in their groups. In the first case, a majority of them (more than 60 percent), were positive about the degree to which they were involved in the process. In the second case, a majority of them (more than 67 percent) believed that the process was difficult and was not supported monetarily. And, in the third case, only a small number of them (less than 40 percent) believed that they received advanced preparation for their working on the design process.

RESEARCH QUESTION 3

What is the nature of the formal organizational structure of the IHE, policy board and task force group in terms of:

a. established operating rules and procedures;
b. individual's autonomy or initiative for working on CBTE;
c. individual's accountability for working on designing the program;
d. individual's defined design role; and
e. adequacy of the reward system.

To address this question, the same procedures as those used for question 1 were followed. As before, Appendix D and E and Table 2 present the data which was used in responding to the question. Each of the five descriptions of the formal structure will be discussed in detail in the following sections.

Nature of the Group's Formal Structure

The data to describe the nature of each group's formal structure by viewing each group's response to up to seven reorganized items - 4, 10, 39, 45, 50, 51 and 57 (see Appendix E and Table 2). Group responses were compared across all the items, although IHE respondents dealt with only six items. The seven items were defined by the degree to which the respondents believed that:

a. there were many rules and procedures describing the group's CBTE design role;

b. the State Education Department (SED) set up many CBTE design rules and procedures;

c. they had little freedom to control the CBTE design events;

d. they were allowed little CBTE design initiative;

e. there were conflicting expectations held about their group's design role;

f. they were held accountable for their design roles; and

g. they received adequate compensation from their own organization for their CBTE design roles.

In general the respondents identified positive and negative characteristics of the formal organizational structure of the consortium groups. On the positive side, a majority of respondents (more than 50 percent) believed they were allowed initiative and had autonomy in working on the design process and were held accountable for their design roles. Their average responses for these items (1.975 for the TF, 2.173 for the PB and 2.719 for the IHE respondents) reflected this trend. Some respondents (40 percent) believed that their roles were also defined, but the average response for this item (2.875 for the TF, 2.440 for the PB and 2.368 for the IHE respondents) were less strong in their agreement. On the negative side, a majority of respondents (more than 50 percent) believed that there were not many design rules or procedures set up and there were few (if any) adequate rewards from their own organization for their design efforts. The average responses for these items (3.257 for the TF, 3.466 for the PB and 3.632 for the IHE respondents) reflected this trend.

In terms of the rules and procedures set up to describe

the CBTE design role for either the task force or policy board, most respondents believed that there were not many rules set up to guide their groups. Only 19 percent of the TF and 24 percent of the PB respondents believed that there were many rules and procedures describing the design roles for their own group, while 44 percent of the TF and 50 percent of the PB did not believe that this was the case. In addition, only 25 percent of the TF, 20 percent of the PB and 26 percent of the IHE respondents believed that the State Education Department (SED) set up many CBTE design rules for their group, while 62 percent of the TF, 48 percent of the PB and 63 percent of the IHE respondents believed that this was not the case.

In terms of individual autonomy, most respondents believed that they had autonomy and were allowed initiative to work on the CBTE design process. Only 37 percent of the IHE, eight percent of the PB and 13 percent of the TF respondents believed that they had little freedom to control the design events, while 26 percent of the IHE, 72 percent of the PB and 75 percent of the TF respondents believed that they had freedom to control the design events. In addition, none of the IHE, eight percent of the PB and six percent of the TF respondents believed that they were allowed little design initiative, while 74 percent of the IHE, 80 percent of the PB and 88 percent of the TF respondents believed that they were allowed design initiative.

In terms of the defined design roles, most respondents believed that there was a defined design role for their group. In this, 47 percent of the IHE, 52 percent of the PB and 25 percent of the TF respondents believed that there were no conflicting expectations held about their design role, while 21 percent of the IHE, 16 percent of the PB and 19 percent of the TF respondents believed that there were conflicting expectations held about their design roles. Not all respondents however, believed that there were expectations for their roles; 32 percent of the IHE, 32 percent of the PB and 56 percent of the TF respondents believed that they had not specifically been assigned a design role.

In terms of individual accountability for their design role, most respondents believed they were held accountable for their role. In this case, 58 percent of the IHE, 44 percent of the PB and 63 percent of the TF respondents believed they were being held accountable for their CBTE design role, while 21 percent of the IHE, 32 percent of the PB and none of the TF respondents believed that they were not held accountable for their roles.

In terms of receiving adequate rewards for their design roles, few respondents believed that this was the case. In fact, only 16 percent of the IHE and PB and six percent of the TF respondents believed that they received adequate rewards from their own organization; while 63 percent of the IHE,

52 percent of the PB and 38 percent of the TF believed that they did not receive adequate rewards from their organizations. Some respondents (56 percent of the TF, 32 percent of the PB and 21 percent of the IHE respondents) believed that their organizations did not have any rewards at all for their performance.

There were differences in the perceptions of the varied groups, particularly in respect to the acknowledged autonomy, defined roles, accountability, and adequate rewards offered the groups. In the first case, more IHE (37 percent) than TF and PB (8 and 13 percent respectively) respondents believed that they had freedom to control the design events. In the second case, more of the IHE and PB (47 and 52 percent respectively) respondents believed that there were conflicting expectations held about their roles, and less of the IHE and PB (32 percent each) respondents than TF (56 percent) respondents believed that they had been assigned a design role. In the third case, fewer PB (44 percent) respondents than IHE and TF (58 and 63 percent respectively) respondents believed they were held accountable, and more PB (32 percent) than IHE and TF (21 percent and none respectively) respondents believed that they were not held accountable. In the last case, more PB and IHE (52 and 63 percent respectively) respondents than TF (38 percent) respondents believed they did not receive adequate rewards, and less PB and IHE (32 and 21 percent) respondents then TF (56 percent) respondents believed that their organizations did not offer

any rewards for their design efforts.

Summary of Formal Organizational Structure

In general, the respondents identified positive and negative characteristics of the formal organizational structure of the consortium groups. On the positive side, a majority of respondents (more than 50 percent) believed that they were allowed initiative and had autonomy in working on the process and were held accountable for their design roles. Some respondents (40 percent) also believed that their design roles were clearly identified. On the negative side, a majority of respondents (more than 50 percent) believed that there were not many design rules/procedures set up and there were few adequate rewards from their own organizations for their design efforts.

RESEARCH QUESTION 4

What is the nature of the informal, organizational environment of the IHE, policy board and task force groups in terms of:

a. each group member's perception of other group member's approval of CBTE;
b. each group member's perception of their own or their group's influence; and
c. each group member's liking of the other group members.

To address this question, the same procedures as those used for Question 1 were followed. As before, Appendix D and E and Table 2 present the data which was used in responding to the question. Each of these three descriptions will be discussed in detail in the following pages.

Perception of Other's Approval of CBTE

The data to describe the perception of other's approval of CBTE was obtained by viewing each group's response to six reorganized items - 2, 8, 13, 19, 25, 31. The six items were defined by the degree to which the respondents believed that:

a. they approved of CBTE;
b. IHE administrators approved of CBTE;
c. the task force or policy board leader approved of CBTE;
d. their group members approved of CBTE;
e. school district administrators approved of CBTE; and,
f. school teachers' unions approved of CBTE.

A majority of the respondents (70 percent of the TF and PB and 51 percent of the IHE respondents) perceived that most of the groups and individuals in the consortium approved of CBTE. The mean response (2.052 for the TF, 1.960 for the PB and 2.430 for the IHE respondents) for each of the groups reflected this trend.

In terms of the major consortium groups themselves, 75 percent of the TF, 76 percent of the PB and 68 percent of the IHE respondents indicated that they approved of CBTE. In terms of the group leaders, 69 percent of the TF and 63 percent of the PB respondents believed that the task force leaders approved of CBTE; 80 percent of the PB respondents believed that the policy board leaders approved of CBTE; and, 81 percent of the TF, 68 percent of the PB and 58 percent of the IHE respondents believed that IHE administrators approved of CBTE. In terms of group members, 50 percent of the TF, 76 percent of the PB and 57 percent of the IHE respondents believed that their own group's members approved of CBTE. In terms of other consoritum groups, 75 percent of the TF, 80 percent of the PB and 42 percent of the IHE respondents believed that school district administrators approved of CBTE, while 69 percent of the TF, 40 percent of the PB and 16 percent of the IHE respondents believed that school district teachers' unions approved of CBTE.

Despite the general consistency in the trend of the respondents' perceptions across the groups, there were observable differences across the groups in terms of the members and percent of respondents in each group who strongly agreed or agreed to the change statements. In terms of perceptions about group members, more PB respondents (76 percent) than TF or IHE respondents (50 and 57 percent respectively) believed that their own group members approved of CBTE. In terms of other consortium groups, more TF and PB respondents (75 and 80 percent respectively) than IHE respondents (42 percent) believed that school district administrators approved of CBTE, while more TF respondents (69 percent) than PB and IHE respondents (40 and 16 percent respectively) believed that school district teachers' unions approved of CBTE.

Perception of Individual/Group Influence

The data to describe the perception of the individual/group was obtained by viewing each groups' response to up to four reordered items - 5, 11, 16 and 22 (see Appendix D and Table 2). Group responses were compared across all four items, although IHE and PB respondents only dealt with three items. The four items were defined by the degree to which the respondents believed that:

a. their group's members could influence the consortium's educational policies/decisions;
b. they could influence the educational policies/decisions of the task force and/or policy board; and

c. they could specifically influence the design of the CBTE plan.

A majority of the respondents (61 percent of the TF, 69 percent of the PB and 60 percent of the IHE respondents) believed that they could generally influence the policies/decisions of the consortium, their own group and other groups; and, specifically influence the design of the CBTE plan. The mean response (2.312 for the TF, 2.013 for the PB and 2.368 for the IHE respondents) for each of the groups reflected this trend.

In terms of influencing the consortium, 60 percent of the TF and 64 percent of the PB respondents believed that they could influence the educational policies/decisions of the consortium. In terms of influencing the task force, 56 percent of the TF respondents and 58 percent of the IHE respondents believed that they could influence the educational policies/decisions of the task force. In terms of influencing the policy board, 66 percent of the PB and 63 percent of the TF and IHE respondents believed that they could influence the educational policies/decisions of the policy board. And, in terms of specifically influencing the design of the CBTE plan, 56 percent of the TF, 76 percent of the PB and 58 percent of the IHE respondents believed that they could accomplish this.

There was only one slight difference in the perceptions of the three groups. In terms of specifically influencing the design of the CBTE plan, more PB respondents (76 percent) than TF or IHE respondents (56 and 58 percent respectively) believed thay they could influence the plan's design.

Individual Liking for Own Members

The data to describe the individual's liking for group members was obtained by viewing the task force and policy board's response to one reorganized item - 28 (see Table 2 and Appendix E). The item was defined by the degree to which the respondents believed that they like to work with their own group.

More than two-thirds of the respondents (75 percent of the TF and 88 percent of the PB respondents) indicated that they liked to work with their own group. The mean responses (1.937 for the TF and 1.760 for the PB respondents) reflected this trend.

Summary of Informal Organizational Environment

A majority of the respondents identified positive rather than negative characteristics of the informal organizational climate of the consortium groups. A majority of the respondents (70 percent of the TF and PB and 51 percent of the IHE respondents) believed that most of the groups and individuals involved in the consortium (with the exception of the school district teachers' unions) approved of CBTE. A majority of the respondents (61 percent of the TF, 69 percent of the PB and 60 percent of the IHE respondents) also believed that they could generally influence the educational policies/decisions of the consortium, task force and policy board and specifically influence the design of the CBTE plan. Finally, 75 percent of the TF and 88 percent of the PB indicated that they liked to work with their own group members.

RESEARCH QUESTION 5

> What are the areas of similarity or dissimilarity in the identified change process of the IHE, policy board and task force when the perceptions of the respondents are analyzed across the varied IHE descriptors of IHE size and type, program registration, respondent group and program type?

To address this question, item means (for each respondent group) were computed for each of the demographic category groupings and a one-way analysis of variance was run across these means. When differences in the item means were computed to exist at the .05 level of significance or higher, they were treated as reflecting areas of dissimilarity and discussed in the following sections. When differences in the item means were not statistically significant at the .05 level, they were treated as reflecting areas of similarity and discussed in questions 1 through 4. In the next section, the item differences will be initially discussed by respondent group and then ultimately analyzed across all groups. All items will be discussed in the positive direction.

Table 3 identifies those items whose mean differences across the groups were statistically significant at the p= .05 level or higher. Appendix F provides the ANOVA TABLE data for each of those items.

IHE Size

For IHE size, each of the respondents' institutions was initially placed in a large or small category depending on the number of its education students. Altogether, 18 (30%) of the respondents worked with small IHEs and 42 (70%) worked with large IHEs.

TABLE 3

Analysis of Variance Across the Organizational Change Variables By Program Success, IHE Type, IHE Size, and IHE Program

Organizational Change Variable	Group Category			
	Registration	IHE Type	IHE Size	IHE Program
1. CBTE should provide sufficient teacher education information for teacher trainers.				
2. I approve of CBTE.	.001 TF			
3. Task force members were given a useful CBTE design inservice training program.		.027 TF .026 IHE		
4. There were many rules and procedures describing our group's CBTE design role.*				
5. Members of our group were able to influence the consortium's educational policies/decisions.				
6. Our group's leader was concerned with what I thought about CBTE.*				
7. CBTE is a more rational and systematic method for training teachers.	.051 TF			
8. IHE administrators approve of CBTE.			.032 IHE	
9. Sufficient CBTE design assistance was given to the task force.		.014 IHE		
10. The State Education Department set up many CBTE design rules and procedures.		.023 TF .010 IHE		
11. I was able to influence our group's educational policies/decisions.*		.018 IHE		
12. Our group leader supported my CBTE design efforts.*		.020 PB		
13. Our group leader approves of CBTE.*				
14. Our group was given an orientation session which helped me understand the CBTE design requirements.*				
15. I had to communicate with the other members of my group to design a CBTE plan.*				
16. I was able to influence the policy board's educational policies/ decisions.				
17. Our group leader spent adequate CBTE design time with me.*				
18. CBTE is a more accountable method for training teachers.				
19. Our group's members approve of CBTE.*	.035 IHE			
20. Sufficient CBTE design funds were made available to the consortium.				
21. I had to communicate with our group's leader to design a CBTE plan.*				

TABLE 3 - continued

Organizational Change Variable	Group Category			
	Registration	IHE Type	IHE Size	IHE Program
22. I was able to influence the design of the CBTE plan.		.018 TF		
23. Our group leader provided CBTE design information.*	.002 TF			
24. CBTE should lead to more effective teacher preparation.	.032 TF			
25. Consortium school district administrators approve of CBTE.			.014 IHE	
26. I received feedback from others in regard to my CBTE design performance/role.			.041 IHE	
27. I had to communicate with IHE administrators to design a CBTE plan.				
28. I liked to work with our group's members.*				
29. Our group leader provided me with the necessary kinds of CBTE design assistance. *				
30. CBTE should lead to more effective teacher performance.				
31. Consortium school teachers' unions approve of CBTE.			.043 IHE	
32. I received feedback from my own administrative superior in regard to my CBTE design performance/role.				
33. I had to communicate with policy board members to design a CBTE plan.				
34. Communication among our group's members focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.*				
35. IHE administrators were concerned with what the task force thought about CBTE.				
36. CBTE should ultimately lead to more effective student school performance.			.014 TF	
37. The initial results of CBTE in teacher preparation in other states have been positive.				
38. Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by task force members only.			.020 PB	
39. I had little freedom to control the CBTE design events.			.047 IHE	
40. Communication between the task force and the policy board focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.	.002 PB	.054 PB		

TABLE 3 - Continued

Organizational Change Variable	Group Category: Registration	IHE Type	IHE Size	IHE Program
41. IHE administrators supported the task force's CBTE design efforts.				
42. Our CBTE plan should lead to more effective teacher performance.				
43. CBTE's principles and components are difficult to understand.				
44. Decisions about designing the CBTE plan were made by task force members only.				
45. I was allowed little initiative in designing a CBTE plan.				
46. IHE administrators spent adequate CBTE design time with the task force.				
47. Our CBTE plan should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.				
48. It took too much time to design a CBTE plan.				
49. Decisions about designing the CBTE plan were made by personnel outside the task force.			.045 PB	
50. There were conflicting expectations held about my (or my group's) CBTE design role. *				
51. I was held accountable for my CBTE design role.	.005 TF			
52. Communication between the task force and the IHE administrators focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.				
53. IHE administrators provided CBTE design information.				
54. Our CBTE plan should provide sufficient teacher education information for teacher trainers.				
55. It was easy to design a CBTE plan.				.032 PB
56. Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by personnel outside the task force.			.014 PB	

TABLE 3 - Continued

Organizational Change Variable	Group Category: Registration	IHE Type	IHE Size	IHE Program
57. I received adequate compensation				
58. I was adequately involved in designing a CBTE plan.				
59. IHE administrators provided the task force with the necessary kinds of CBTE design assistance.	.013 TF			
60. Our CBTE plan should set up a more rational, systematic method for training teachers.				
61. When CBTE details were first presented to me (or my group), its objectives were clearly defined.				
62. I participated to the extent that I desired in making CBTE design decisions.				
63. When CBTE details were first presented to me (or my group) research findings about its effects in training teachers were not mentioned.	.040 TF	.014 IHE		
64. Our group was not well kept informed on the CBTE design decisions and actions taken by the other group.		.005 IHE		
65. Necessary CBTE design materials and supplies were not provided on time.				
66. Procedures for setting up a CBTE plan were clearly defined by the policy board.				
67. Task force meetings were scheduled when problems were encountered in designing a CBTE plan.	.009 TF			

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS: IHE = 19
PB = 16
TF = 25

All reported probability ratios significant at the .054 level or higher.

KEY: IHE = Institution of Higher Education
PB = Policy Board
TF = Task Force

When the means were analyzed across large and small IHEs, statistically significant differences were computed for ten reorganized items - 8, 25, 26, 31, 36, 38, 39, 49, 56 and 57 (see Table 3). Differences were seen to exist in the degree to which IHE respondents from large or small IHEs believed that:

a. IHE administrators approved of CBTE

b. school district administrators approved of CBTE

c. IHE members received CBTE performance feedback from others

d. school district teachers' unions approved of CBTE

e. IHE members had freedom to control CBTE design events.

Differences were also seen to exist in the degree to which TF respondents from large or small IHEs believed that:

a. CBTE should lead to more effective student school performance

b. TF members received adequate compensation from their own organizations for their design efforts.

And, differences were seen to exist in the degree to which PB respondents from large or small IHEs believed that:

a. CBTE content decisions were made by task force members only

b. CBTE process decisions were made by personnel outside the task force

c. CBTE content decisions were made by personnel outside the task force

Of these ten items, four related to the process of changing, three related to the informal organizational environment, two related to the formal organizational structure and one related to the individual perceptions of CBTE.

In terms of the process of changing, one item related to performance feedback and three related to decision making. More of the IHE respondents at small than large IHEs agreed that they received CBTE feedback from others (small IHE $\bar{x}$ = 2.600, large IHE $\bar{x}$ = 3.667). And, more of the PB respondents at large than small IHEs agreed that CBTE content decisions were made by task force members only (large IHE $\bar{x}$ = 1.636, small IHE $\bar{x}$=2.600). In addition, more of the PB respondents from small than large IHEs disagreed that CBTE process decisions were made by personnel outside the task force (small $\bar{x}$=3.188) and that CBTE content decisions were made by personnel outside the task force (small $\bar{x}$ = 4.375, large $\bar{x}$ = 3.250).

In terms of the informal organizational environment, all three items related to different individuals' approval of CBTE. More of the IHE respondents from small than large IHEs agreed that the IHE administrators (small $\bar{x}$ = 1.600, large $\bar{x}$ = 2.600), the school district administrators (small $\bar{x}$ = 2.600, large $\bar{x}$ = 3.667) approved of CBTE.

In terms of the formal organizational structure, one item related to individual autonomy to control events and one to compensation for design effort. More of the IHE respondents from small than large IHEs agreed that they had less freedom to control CBTE design events (small $\bar{x}$ = 2.000, large $\bar{x}$ = 3.400). Also, more of the TF respondents from small than large IHEs

disagreed that they received adequate compensation from their organization (small $\bar{x}$ = 4.400, large $\bar{x}$ =3.273).

In terms of the perception of CBTE, more of the IHE respondents from large than small IHEs agreed that CBTE should lead to more effective student school performance (large $\bar{x}$ = 1.636, small $\bar{x}$ = 2.600).

IHE Type

For IHE type, each of the respondents' institutions was grouped according to whether it was a private or public institution. In this grouping, twelve (20%) of the respondents worked with public IHEs and 48 (80%) worked with private IHEs.

For this category, statistically significant differences were found to exist for eleven reorganized items - 3*, 9 , 10*, 11, 12, 22, 40, 63 and 64 (See Table 3 and Appendix F). Differences were found in the degree to which IHE respondents from public or private IHEs believed that:

a. members of the task force were given a useful CBTE inservice training program

b. sufficient design assistance was given to the task force

c. The State Education Department (SED) set up many CBTE design rules and procedures

d. IHE members were able to influence the task force's educational policies/decisions

e. when details of CBTE were presented to IHE members, CBTE research findings were not mentioned

f. the task force was not kept informed of policy board's decisions/actions on CBTE

* The starred items indicate that differences in item means were identified for two respondent groups.

Differences were also found in the degree to which TF respondents from public or private IHEs believed that:

a. members of the task force were given a useful CBTE inservice training program

b. the SED set up many CBTE design rules/procedures

c. TF members were able to influence the design for CBTE

And, differences were found in the degree to which PB respondents from public or private IHEs believed that:

a. the policy board leader supported their CBTE design efforts

b. communication between the policy board and task force focused on CBTE information exchange.

Across the eleven items, seven related to the process of changing, two related to the formal organizational structure and two related to the informal organizational environment.

In terms of the process of changing, two items related to inservice training, two to design assistance, one to communication networks, one to research findings and one to feedback networks. More of the IHE respondents from private than public IHEs disagreed (private IHE $\bar{x}$ = 4.167, public IHE $\bar{x}$ = 3.071) and more of the TF respondents from private than public IHEs disagreed that the task force received a useful CBTE inservice training program (private $\bar{x}$ = 2.333, public $\bar{x}$ = 3.667). In addition, more of the IHE respondents from private than public IHEs agreed that sufficient design assistance was given to the task force (private $\bar{x}$ = 2.571 and public $\bar{x}$ = 3.833) and more of the PB

respondents from private than public IHEs agreed that the policy board leaders supported their efforts (private $\bar{x}$ = 1.667, public $\bar{x}$ = 3.000). In terms of communication networks, more of the PB respondents from private than public IHEs agreed that communication between the task force and policy board focused on CBTE information exchange (private $\bar{x}$ = 2.048, public $\bar{x}$ = 3.000). In terms of research findings, more of the IHE respondents from public than private IHEs agreed that research findings were not mentioned when CBTE details were first presented (public $\bar{x}$ = 1.167, private $\bar{x}$ = 2.929). And in terms of feedback networks, more of the IHE respondents from private than public IHEs disagreed that the task force was not kept well informed on the policy board's design activities (private $\bar{x}$ = 4.286, public $\bar{x}$ = 2.833).

In this, more of the TF respondents from the private than public IHEs disagreed (private $\bar{x}$ = 4.000, public $\bar{x}$ = 2.333) and more of the IHE respondents from private than public IHEs disagreed that the SED set up many CBTE design rules and procedures (private $\bar{x}$ = 4.000, public $\bar{x}$ = 2.333).

In terms of the informal organizational environment, both items related to the respondents' ability to influence others. More of the IHE respondents from private than public IHEs agreed that they were able to influence the educational policies/decisions made by the task force (private $\bar{x}$ = 1.929, public $\bar{x}$ = 3.333) and more of the TF respondents from private than public IHEs agreed that they were able to influence the design for the CBTE plan (private $\bar{x}$ = 2.077, public $\bar{x}$ = 3.333).

Program Registration

For program registration, each of the institutions received either a one year or four year registration. These two types of registrations were used for the category groupings. Twenty-nine respondents (48%) were members of a consortium receiving one year registration and 31 respondents (52%) were members of a consortium receiving four year registration.

For this category, statistically significant differences were found for ten items - 2, 7, 19, 23, 40, 51, 59, 63 and 67 (see Table 3 and Appendix F). Differences were seen to exist in the degree to which IHE respondents with one year or four year program registration believed that members of the task force approved of CBTE. Differences were also seen to exist in the degree to which TF respondents with one year or four year program registration believed that:

a. TF members approved of CBTE

b. CBTE was a more rational, systematic method for training teachers than present methods

c. the task force leader provided CBTE design information

d. CBTE should lead to more effective teacher preparation

e. TF members were held accountable for their CBTE design role

f. IHE administrators provided them with necessary CBTE design assistance

g. when CBTE details were first present, research findings about CBTE effects in other states were not mentioned.

h. task force meetings were scheduled when CBTE problems were encountered.

Differences were also seen to exist in the degree to which PB respondents from one year or four year registration IHEs believed that communication between the task force and policy board focused on CBTE information exchange. Of the ten items, five related to the process of changing, two related to the informal organizational environment, two related to the individual perception of CBTE and one related to the formal organizational structure.

In terms of the process of changing, two items related to design assistance, one item related to communication, one to problem solving and one to research findings. In terms of design assistance, more of the TF respondents with four year than one year program registration agreed that the task force leader provided them with CBTE design information (four year $\bar{x}$ = 2.000, one year $\bar{x}$ = 3.000) and more agreed that IHE administrators provided them with necessary CBTE assistance (four year $\bar{x}$ = 2.556, one year $\bar{x}$ = 3.286). In terms of communication, more of the PB respondents with four year than one year program registration agreed that communication between the task force and policy board focused on CBTE information exchange (four year $\bar{x}$ = 1.500, one year $\bar{x}$ = 3.200). In terms of problem solving, more of the TF respondents with four year than one year program registration agreed that task force meetings were scheduled when CBTE problems were encountered. And, in terms of research findings, more of the TF respondents with four year than one year program registration agreed that research findings were not mentioned when CBTE details were first presented (four year $\bar{x}$ = 2.111, one year $\bar{x}$ = 3.143).

In terms of the individual perceptions of CBTE, more of the TF respondents with one year than four year program registration believed that CBTE was a more rational, systematic teacher training method than the present methods (one year $\bar{x}$ = 1,571, four year $\bar{x}$ = 2.555) and more believed that CBTE should lead to more effective teacher preparation (one year $\bar{x}$ = 1.429, four year $\bar{x}$ = 2.111).

And, in terms of the formal organizational structure, more of the TF respondents with four year than one year program registration believed that they were held accountable for their CBTE design performance (four year $\bar{x}$ = 1.667, one year $\bar{x}$ = 2.714).

Program Type

Programs in each of the institutions ranged from elementary, speech, and special to others. Since the CBTE mandate deadline of 1975 related to the design of elementary programs rather than other programs, the number of programs across the groups was not balanced. Fifty-two (87%) of the respondents working in consortia which designed an elementary program and only eight (13%) worked in consortia which designed other programs. Because of this imbalance in the number of programs, an analysis of variance was not run on any of the items.

Respondent Group

An analysis of variance of the differences in item means was not run across respondent groups because the items were not comparable statistically. Although the same item or similar concept area were often included on each of the respondent group's questionnaire, the items and overall context of each

group's questionnaire were judged too dissimilar for formal comparison. The only differences (or similarities) to be commented upon were those relating to the percent of respondents in each group who agreed or disagreed the change statements. Research question 1 through 4 dealt with this comparison.

Summary of the Differences in Organizational Change Characteristics

For most items, few statistically significant differences at the .05 level or higher were found. For two demographic groupings, program type and respondent groups, no analyses were performed.

Of the 31 items where statistically significant differences across demographic group means were computed, ten occurred in the large-small IHE grouping, ten occurred in the four year-one year program registration grouping and eleven occurred in the private-public IHE grouping. In terms of the change element itself, 16 of the 31 items (52 percent) related to the process of changing, seven (23 percent) related to the informal organizational environment, five (16 percent) related to the formal organizational structure and three (ten percent) related to the individual's perceptions of CBTE.

Most of the observed differences across the demographic groupings were in the anticipated direction. As expected, more of the respondents in small and private rather than large and public IHEs and more of the respondents with four year

rather than one year program registration were positive about the process of changing and the informal organizational environment.

In the area of the process of changing, more of the respondents from small rather than large IHEs believed that they received CBTE feedback and shared the making of CBTE decisions across groups. Also, more of the respondents from private rather than public IHEs believed that the task force received sufficient assistance, that the policy board leader supported the policy board's design effort, that the policy board and task force exchanged CBTE information, that CBTE research findings were mentioned and that the task force was kept informed of others' design activities. And, more of the respondents with four year rather than one year program registration believed that the task force leader provided them with CBTE information, that IHE administrators provided them with necessary assistance, that the policy board and task force exchanged CBTE information and that task force meetings were scheduled when CBTE design problems were encountered.

In terms of the informal organizational environment, more of the respondents from small rather than large IHEs believed that the IHEs administrators, school district administrators, and school teachers' unions approved of CBTE. Also, more of the respondents from private rather than public IHEs believed that they could influence educational policies and decisions.

Despite what was expected, however, the differences in respondents' perception of the formal organizational structure and CBTE itself were not in the anticipated direction. In terms of the formal structure, more of the respondents from large rather than small IHEs agreed that they had more freedom to control the design events and agreed that they received adequate compensation. Also, more of the respondents from public rather than private IHEs agreed that the SED had set up CBTE design rules.

In terms of the perceptions of CBTE, more of the respondents from large rather than small IHEs believed that CBTE would lead to effective student performance and more of the respondents with one year rather than four year program registration believed that CBTE would lead to effective teacher preparation and was a more rational, systematic teacher training method than those methods used presently.

RESEARCH QUESTION 6

What is the relationship, if any, between the varied elements of organizational change?

To address this question, a principle components factor analysis with varimax rotation was run on all the organizational change variables in each questionnaire. Table 4 and Appendix G present the results of this analysis. Table 4 identifies those items which correlated with others to a degree greater than $\pm$ .500. Appendix G presents those correlation figures.

As has been expected, the variables within each of the three questionnaires were strongly interrelated. To a large degree, the à priori factor groupings of the change variables (individual perception of CBTE, process of changing, formal organizational structure and informal organizational environment) were maintained. Essentially two of the four à priori factors (process of changing and formal organizational structure) were still identified as major factors. The other two à priori factors (perceptions of CBTE and informal organizational climate) were partially assimilated within the process of changing factor and partially broken down into smaller, secondary factors.

TABLE 4

Principal Components Factor Analysis of Organizational Change Variable -- All Questionnaires

Variable Category	Factor Membership, R ≥ .500		
	IHE	Policy Board	Task Force
1. CBTE should provide sufficient teacher education information for teacher trainers.	None	7	1
2. I approve of CBTE	None	1	1,2*
3. Task force members were given a useful CBTE design inservice training program.	3	1	1
4. There were many rules and procedures describing our group's CBTE design role.*	-	None	1
5. Members of our group were able to influence the consortium's educational policies/decisions.	-	1	1
6. Our group's leader was concerned with what I thought about CBTE.*	-	None	1
7. CBTE is a more rational and systematic method for training teachers.	1	1	1
8. IHE administrators approve of CBTE	3,10*	1	1
9. Sufficient CBTE design assistance was given to the task force.	3	1	1
10. The State Education Department set up many CBTE design rules and procedures.	4	None	2
11. I was able to influence our group's educational policies/decisions.*	1	1	1
12. Our group leader supported my CBTE design efforts.*	-	2	1,5*
13. Our group leader approves of CBTE.*	3,4*	1	1
14. Our group was given an orientation session which helped me understand the CBTE design requirements.*	None	1,3*	None
15. I had to communicate with the other members of my group to design a CBTE plan.*	-	1	1
16. I was able to influence the policy board's educational policies/ decisions.	3	-	1
17. Our group leader spent adequate CBTE design time with me.*	-	1,2*	1
18. CBTE is a more accountable method for training teachers.	1	1,2*	1,2*
19. Our group's members approve of CBTE.*	1	1	1

TABLE 4 (continued)

Variable Category	Factor Membership, R 2+ .500		
	IHE	Policy Board	Task Force
20. Sufficient CBTE design funds were made available to the consortium	2	1	1
21. I had to communicate with our group's leader to design a CBTE plan.*	-	1,2*	1
22. I was able to influence the design of the CBTE plan.	2	1	1
23. Our group leader provided CBTE design information.*		1,2*	1,2*
24. CBTE should lead to more effective teacher preparation.	1	1	1
25. Consortium school district administrators approve of CBTE	1,8*	1	1
26. I received feedback from others in regard to my CBTE design performance/role.	5	4	1
27. I had to communicate with IHE administrators to design a CBTE plan.	-	-	None
28. I liked to work with our group's members.*	-	1	4
29. Our group leader provided me with the necessary kinds of CBTE design assistance.*	-	1,2*	1
30. CBTE should lead to more effective teacher performance.	1	1,2*	1
31. Consortium school teachers' unions approve of CBTE.	1	1	1
32. I received feedback from my own administrative superior in regard to my CBTE design performance/ role.	2,6*	4	1
33. I had to communicate with policy board members to design a CBTE plan.	-	-	1
34. Communication among our group's members focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.*	-	1	1
35. IHE administrators were concerned with what the task force thought about CBTE.	-	-	1
36. CBTE should ultimately lead to more effective student school performance	1	1,2*	1
37. The initial results of CBTE in teacher preparation in other states have been positive.	None	3	2

TABLE 4 (continued)

Variable Category	Factor Membership, R 2≥ .500 IHE	Policy Board	Task Force
38. Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by task force members only	2	None	1,4*
39. I had little freedom to control the CBTE design events.	1	1,2*	1,5*
40. Communication between the task force and the policy board focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.	None	1	1
41. IHE administrators supported the task force's CBTE design efforts.	-	-	1,3*
42. Our CBTE plan should lead to more effective teacher performance	1	1,2*	1
43. CBTE's principles and components are difficult to understand.	7	5	4
44. Decisions about designing the CBTE plan were made by task force members only.	2	3	4
45. I was allowed little initiative in designing a CBTE plan.	5	8	1
46. IHE administrators spent adequate CBTE design time with the task force.	-	-	1
47. Our CBTE plan should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.	1	1,2*	1
48. It took too much time to design a CBTE plan.	5	3,6*	1
49. Decisions about designing the CBTE plan were made by personnel outside the task force.	1	3	1,7*
50. There were conflicting expectations held about my (or my group's) CBTE design role.*	None	3	1,2*
51. I was held accountable for my CBTE design role.	2,6,7*	6	1
52. Communication between the task force and the IHE administrators focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.	2	None	1,3*
53. IHE administrators provided CBTE design information	3,6*	1	3
54. Our CBTE plan should provide sufficent teacher education information for teacher trainers.	1	None	1,3*
55. It was easy to design a CBTE plan.	4	4	1
56. Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by personnel outside the task force	2	None	1

TABLE 4 (continued)

Variable Category	Factor Membership, R ≥ ± .500 IHE	Policy Board	Task Force
57. I received adequate compensation from my own organization for my CBTE design role.	2,5*	None	1
58. I was adequately involved in designing a CBTE plan.	1	1,5*	1
59. IHE administrators provided the task force with the necessary kinds of CBTE design assistance.	-	-	1
60. Our CBTE plan should set up a more rational, systematic method for training teachers.	1	1,2*	1
61. When CBTE details were first presented to me (or my group), its objectives were clearly defined.	None	1	1
62. I participated to the extent that I desired in making CBTE design decisions.	1	1,5*	1,2*
63. When CBTE details were first presented to me (or my group) research findings about its effects in training teachers were not mentioned.	None	None	1
64. Our group was not kept well informed on the CBTE design decisions and actions taken by the other group.	2,3,4*	1,4	1
65. Necessary CBTE design materials and supplies were not provided on time.	1	1	1
66. Procedures for setting up a CBTE plan were clearly defined by the policy board.	8	-	1
67. Task force meetings were scheduled when problems were encountered in designing a CBTE plan.	-	4	2

Total Number of Respondents - 60

Response Key

- = Item not contained in questionnaire
None = No correlations with Factors > ± .500

* Item is correlated (R ≥ ± .500) with more than one factor

RESEARCH QUESTION 7

What is the set of organizational change variables which most strongly relates to a CBTE design program being accepted for a four rather than a one year period?

To address this question, a multiple regression analysis was run on all the variables in each questionnaire. (All the variables were reversed, so that they would all be positive.) Table 5 and Appendix H present the results of this analysis. Table 5 identifies those variables across all three questionnaires which together most strongly related to a CBTE program being accepted for a four year period. Appendix H presents the multiple regression equation of those variables in each questionnaire which most strongly related to a CBTE program being accepted for a four year period.

The multiple regression equations (see Appendix H) for each respondent group, task force, policy board and IHE, were highly related to four year program registration. Altogether, there were six items in the TF equation, eleven in the PB equation and nine in the IHE equation which individually provided more than two percent of the variance associated with predicting four uear registration. The other variables were dropped from the equations if they provided less than two percent of the variance.

In the equation for the task force respondents, five of the six equation variables related to the process of changing factors and one related to the formal organizational structure

TABLE 5

Stepwise Multiple Regression of the Organizational Change Variables as Predictors of Four Year Program Registration: Variable"s Contribution to Pred.cted Variance (R^2)

Variable Category	Variable's Contribution to Predicted Variance and Place in Equation		
	IHE	Policy Board	Task Force
1. CBTE should provide sufficient teacher education information for teacher trainers.			
2. I approve of CBTE.	(6).0617	(1) .2604	
3. Task force members were given a useful CBTE design inservice training program.	(4).0972		(1) .6409
4. There were many rules and procedures describing our group's CBTE design role.*			
5. Members of our group were able to influence the consortium's educational policies/decisions.		(2) (6) removed **	
6. Our group's leader was concerned with what I thought about CBTE.*		(11) .0331	
7. CBTE is a more rational and systematic method for training teachers.		(7) .0685	
8. IHE administrators approve of CBTE.			
9. Sufficient CBTE design assistance was given to the task force.			
10. The State Education Department set up many CBTE design rules and procedures.			
11. I was able to influence our group's educational policies/decisions.*			
12. Our group leader supported my CBTE design efforts.*			
13. Our group leader approves of CBTE.*			
14. Our group was given an orientation session which helped me understand the CBTE design requirements.*			
15. I had to communicate with the other members of my group to design a CBTE plan.*		(5) .1251	
16. I was able to influence the policy board's educational policies/ decisions.			
17. Our group leader spent adequate CBTE design time with me.*			
18. CBTE is a more accountable method for training teachers.			
19. Our group's members approve of CBTE.*			
20. Sufficient CBTE design funds were		(1) .3368	

TABLE 5 (continued)

Variable Category	Variable's Contribution to Predicted Variance and Place in Equation		
	IHE	Policy Board	Task Force
21. I had to communicate with our group's leader to design a CBTE plan.*		(9) .0351	
22. I was able to influence the design of the CBTE plan.	-	-	-
23. Our group leader provided CBTE design information.*	-	-	-
24. CBTE should lead to more effective teacher preparation.	-	-	-
25. Consortium school district administrators approve of CBTE.	-	-	-
26. I received feedback from others in regard to my CBTE design performance/role.	-	-	-
27. I had to communicate with IHE administrators to design a CBTE plan.	-	-	-
28. I liked to work with our group's members.*	-	-	-
29. Our group leader provided me with the necessary kinds of CBTE design assistance.*	-	-	-
30. CBTE should lead to more effective teacher performance.	-	-	-
31. Consortium school teachers' unions approve of CBTE.	-	-	-
32. I received feedback from my own administrative superior in regard to my CBTE design performance/role.	-	-	-
33. I had to communicate with policy board members to design a CBTE plan.	-	-	-
34. Communication among our group's members focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.*	-	(12) .0367	
35. IHE administrators were concerned with what the task force thought about CBTE.	-	-	-
36. CBTE should ultimately lead to more effective student school performance.	-	-	-
37. The initial results of CBTE in teacher preparation in other states have been positive.	-	-	-
38. Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by task force members only.	(5).0952		
39. I had little freedom to control the CBTE design events.	-	-	-

TABLE 5 (continued)

Variable Category	Variable's Contribution to Predicted Variance and Place in Equation		
	IHE	Policy Board	Task Force
40. Communication between the task force and the policy board focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.	-	-	-
41. IHE administrators supported the task force's CBTE design efforts.	-	-	-
42. Our CBTE plan should lead to more effective teacher performance.	-	(4) .0682	-
43. CBTE's principles and components are difficult to understand.	-	-	-
44. Decisions about designing the CBTE plan were made by task force members only.	-	-	-
45. I was allowed little initiative in designing a CBTE plan.	(2) .1842	-	-
46. IHE administrators spent adequate CBTE design time with the task force.	-	-	-
47. Our CBTE plan should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.	-	-	-
48. It took too much time to design a CBTE plan.	-	-	-
49. Decisions about designing the CBTE plan were made by personnel outside the task force.	-	-	-
50. There were conflicting expectations held about my (or my group's) CBTE DESIGN ROLE.*	(3) .0887		
51. I was held accountable for my CBTE design role.	-	-	(5) .0427
52. Communication between the task force and the IHE administrators focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.	-	(3) .0907	(4) .0830
53. IHE administrators provided CBTE design information.	(8) .0285	-	-
54. Our CBTE plan should provide sufficient teacher education information for teacher trainers.	-	-	-
55. It was easy to design a CBTE plan.	-	-	-
56. Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by personnel outside the task force.	-	-	-
57. I received adequate compensation from my own organization for my CBTE design role.	-	-	-
58. I was adequately involved in designing a CBTE plan.	(9) .0208	-	(3) .0662
59. IHE administrators provided the task force with the necessary kinds of CBTE design assistance.	-	-	-

TABLE 5 (continued)

Variable Category	Variable's Contribution to Predicted Variance and Place in Equation		
	IHE	Policy Board	Task Force
60. Our CBTE plan should set up a more rational, systematic method for training teachers.	-	-	-
61. When CBTE details were first presented to me (or my group), its objectives were clearly defined.	-	(8) .0407	-
62. I participated to the extent that I desired in making CBTE design decisions.	-	-	-
63. When CBTE details were first presented to me (or my group) research findings about its effects in training teachers were not mentioned.	-	-	-
64. Our group was not well kept informed on the CBTE design decisions and actions taken by the other group.	-	(10) .0557	(2) .1063
65. Necessary CBTE design materials and supplies were not provided on time.	-	-	(6) .0314
66. Procedures for setting up a CBTE plan were clearly defined by the policy board.	(7) .0419	-	-
67. Task force meetings were scheduled when problems were encountered in designing a CBTE plan.	-	(13) .0247	-
TOTALS: Predicted Variance	(9) .9550	(13) .9195	(7) .9705

* All variables from regression equations contributing more than two percent of variance are reported herein

** Variable entered, and removed

Total number of respondents - 60

factor. Together these six variables in combination predicted 97 percent of the variance associated with obtaining a four rather than a one year registration (R_2=.9705). Their total correlation coefficient was .9851. Those variables in terms of their contribution to the predicted variance (identified as R_3) are: (1) the task force was given a useful CBTE inservice training program (R_3=.6409); (2) the task force was kept well informed of the policy board's activities (R_3=.1063); (3) the respondent was adequately involved in designing the CBTE plan (R_3=.0662); (4) communication between the task force and policy board focused on CBTE information excahnge (R_3=.0830); (5) the respondent was held accountable for his/her CBTE performance (R_3=.0427); and, (6) materials and supplies needed to design CBTE were received on time (R_3=.0314).

In the equation for the policy board respondents, eight of the eleven equation variables related to the process of changing factor, two related to the perception of CBTE factor and one related to the informal organizational environment factor. Together these eleven variables in combination predicted 92 percent of the variance associated with obtaining a four year program registration (R_2=.9195). Their total correlation coefficient was .9589. Those variables in terms of their contribution to the predicted variance (identified as R_3) are: (1) the respondent approves of CBTE (R_3=.2604); (2) communication between the policy board and IHE administrators

focused on CBTE information exchange (R_3=.0812); (3) CBTE should lead to more effective teacher performance (R_3=.0907); (4) the respondent must communicate with the policy board members to design the plane (R_3=.0682); (5) CBTE is a more rational, systematic method than present teacher training methods (R =.0685); (6) when CBTE was first mentioned, objectives of CBTE were clearly defined (R =.0403); (7) the respondent must communicate with the policy board leader tc design the plan (R =.0351); (8) the policy board was kept well informed on the task force's design activities (R =.0557); (9) the policy board leader was concerned with what the respondent thought about CBTE (R =.0331); (10) communication among policy board members focused on information exchange (R =.0367); and, (11) policy board meetings were scheduled when CBTE problems were encountered (R =.1247).

In the equation for the IHE respondents, four of the nine variables related to the process of changing factor, three related to the informal organizational environment factor and one related to the individual's perception of CBTE factor. Together these nine variables in combination predicted 96 percent of the variance associated with obtaining a four year program registration (R_2=.9530). Their total correlation coefficient was .9773. Those variables in terms of their contribution to the predicted variance (identified as R_3) are: (1) sufficient CBTE funds were made available to the consortium (R_3=.3368); (2) the respondent had freedom to control the

events that influenced the design of a CBTE plan (R_3 = .1842); (3) there were no conflicting expectations about the respondent's design role (R_3 = ,0882); (4) the task force was given a useful inservice CBTE training program (R_3 = .0972); (5) the designed CBTE plan should provide sufficient information for decision makers (R_3 = .095?); (6) the resppndent approves of CBTE (R_3 = .0617); (7) the policy board defined many rules and procedures for designing CBTE (R_3 = .0419); (8) the IHE administrators provided CBTE design information (R_3 = .0285); and, (9) the respondent was adequately involved in designing a CBTE plan (R_3 = .0208).

There are many similarities across the multiple regression equations. Of the 26 variables identified across the equation, 17 (65 percent) related to the process of changing factor, five (19 percent) related to the formal organizational structure, two (eight percent) related to the informal organizational environment and two (eight percent) related to the perceptions of CBTE. Overall, the largest prediction of four year program registration were: (1) the task force was given a useful inservice program (accounting for 64 percent of the TF and 10 percent of the IHE equation); (2) sufficient design funds or materials were made available to the varied groups (accounting for 33 percent of the IHE and three percent of the TF equation); (3) the respondent approves of CBTE (accounting for 26 percent of the PB and six percent of the IHE equation); (4) the use of communication network to exchange CBTE information (accounting for 23 percent of the PB and eight percent of the TF equation);

(5) the respondent had freedom to control the events that influenced the design of a CBTE plan (accounting for 18 percent of the IHE equation); and, (6) the varied groups were kept informed of other group's CBTE activities (accounting for ten percent of the TF and six percent of the PB equation).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE PROCESS

The basis for this section rests on answers to four questions. Each one of them will be addressed in turn.

SUMMARY QUESTION NO. 1

What was the nature of the CBTE design process followed by those consortia in New York who worked to develop CBTE programs in 1975-1976?

To address this question, respondents' perceptions of the design process were organized around four factors relating to: (1) CBTE and the designed CBTE program; (2) the design process itself; (3) the formal organizational structure of the consortia; and, (4) the informal organizational environment of the consortia. Each one of these factors was used to describe the nature of the design process.

Most of the task force (TF), policy board (PB) and institution of higher education (IHE) respondents in the study were positive about CBTE and the designed program. A majority of the TF, PB and IHE respondents believed that CBTE and their designed programs:

.... should provide sufficient teacher training information

.... should lead to more effective teacher preparation and performance

.... was a more rational, systematic, accountable method than present methods

.... should lead to more effective student performance

The respondents' perceptions about the design process were mixed, as they believed it was composed of positive and negative characteristics. On the positive side, a majority of the respondents believed that:

.... group communication networks were used

.... CBTE design information was channeled through the group communication networks

.... TF and PB leaders psychologically and logistically supported their group's design efforts

.... the designers of the program were kept appraised of their performance

.... the design group shared CBTE decision making about the design content and process

.... the designers were adequately involved in the design process

.... the design groups were provided with the necessary materials and supplies

On the negative side, a majority of the respondents believed that:

.... PB and IHE leader communication networks were not completely used

.... the designers were not logistically supported with necessary inservice training or design funds

.... the design groups were not kept informed of other design groups' activities

.... the IHE leaders were not logistically or psychologically supportive of the designers' efforts

... the designers were not given adequate advance preparation for working on CBTE

.... the CBTE design process was difficult to undertake

The respondents' perception about the formal organizational structure of the consortia were mixed. On the positive side, a majority of respondents believed that:

.... the designers were allowed initiative to and had autonomy in working on the design process

.... the designers were held accountable for their design roles

.... their design roles were partially identified in advance

On the negative side, a majority of respondents believed that:

.... the State Education Department and Policy Board had not set up many CBTE design rules/procedures to assist the design efforts

.... the designers were not adequately rewarded by their own organizations for their design efforts

The respondents' perception about the informal organizational environment of the consortia were more positive than negative. A majority of the respondents believed that:

.... most of the groups and individuals involved in the consortia approved of CBTE

.... most of the groups and individuals could influence the educational policies/decisions of the consortia

.... most of the groups and individuals could influence the design of the consortium's CBTE plan

.... the task force and policy board members liked to work with each other

SUMMARY QUESTION NO. 2

What organizational change variables facilitated the design of a CBTE program?

Many variables were identified as important in the design of a CBTE program. Together, the organizational change variables accounted for more than 90 percent of the variance related to the design of a program which received four years registration. Whether this registration was indicative of a successful CBTE program is not addressed here; rather for this study, it was assumed that four year rather than one year registration was merely indicative of an easier design effort, since consortia receiving four year program registration do not immediately have to redesign their programs for a second State Education review.

Of the 67 variables studied in relation to the design of a CBTE program, 26 of them were found, through multiple regression analysis, to strongly relate to the design of a four year program registration across all three respondent groups (in descending order of their contribution to the predicted variance) were:

.... the task force was given a useful inservice CBTE training program

.... sufficient design funds or materials were provided the design groups

.... the individual designers and design groups approved of CBTE

.... group communication channels were used to exchange CBTE design information

.... the IHE administrators had freedom to control the events that influenced the design of CBTE

.... the policy board and task force groups were kept informed of each other's design activities

SUMMARY QUESTION NO. 3

Are all consortia equal in their ability to design a CBTE program without too much effort?

It does not seem likely that all consortia are equal in their ability to design a CBTE program without much effort. There were many differences in the processes followed across consortia and these differences likely affected the ease with which the CBTE program will ultimately be developed. It appears that consortia which worked with small and private IHEs rather than large and public IHEs were more likely to design a CBTE process which: (1) used feedback network; (2) shared CBTE decision making; (3) provided designers with adequate logistical and psychological support; (4) used communication networks; (5) kept design groups informed of each other's activities; and, (6) had CBTE approvals from IHE and school district administrators and school district teachers' unions.

Consortia which work with large and public IHEs need to be aware of their inherent problem in working together on the design of any "new" program. Because of their size and the number of special content groups involved, they are likely

to have more problems in: (1) setting up communication networks within and across groups; (2) sharing decision making activities; (3) providing psychological support for their personnel; (4) keeping their group informed of each other's activities; and (5) gaining the approval for the new program from all the involved groups. These problems in turn are likely to effect the consortium's ability to easily undertake a design effort.

SUMMARY QUESTION NO. 4

What variables can be used as strategic, manipulable levers in the design of CBTE programs?

The study's findings lead us to conclude that the CBTE program can be more easily designed if the IHE administrators and the consortia leaders work together to:

.... set up communication network between the consortium design groups

.... channel CBTE information exchange through the communication networks

.... obtain some design funds and materials to support the consortium's efforts

.... set up an inservice training program to assist the consortium designers in developing the program

.... keep the policy board and task force groups informed of each others' design activities

None of these suggestions are surprising, the fact that they are not <u>now</u> being used in many consortia is, however.

APPENDIX A

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

All of these suggestions should be able to be followed by any consortia group interested in developing a CBTE program without a great amount of effort.

APPENDIX B

RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS

NUMBER OF RESPONSES BY CATEGORY

RESPONSES PER INSTITUTION BY ROLE

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Due to the wide variety of approaches taken throughout the state in developing the CBTE format, it is necessary to standardize the following terms to insure consistencey in collection and interpretation of responses.

1. Consortium- The collective entity comprised of the agencies and institutions involved in developing the CBTE program. The consortia might include; Teachers' Unions, Community Organizations, Institutions of Higher Education (IHE), School Districts, etc.

2. Policy Board- Group which coordinates and/or directs the activitites of the consortia membership as the CBTE format is developed. The Policy Board consists of representatives of the groups who participate in the Consortium.

3. Task Force- Group responsible specifically for the development of the program proposal. Task Force usually consists of members of the various organizations in the consortia who have an interest or expertise in a specific educational area. For instance, a Task Force on elementary education might consist of two faculty members from a university, three elementary school teachers, and two parents.

4. IHE- This refers to the Institution of Higher Education involved in the consortium.

5. Mandate- The provisions of Education Law #6842 and the criteria establised by the State Education Department, Division of Teacher Education and Certification which outlined the competency-based requirements for program registration with the State Education Department.

6. School District- School District involved in the consortium.

7. Professional Agency- This usually refers to the Teachers' Union involved in the consortium.

8. Program Proposal- Document submitted, by the IHE and consortia, to the State Education Department for registration.

9. Program Registration- Refers to the State Education Department's decision to register a program for one year or four years.

NOTE: All programs and program proposals, forming the focal point of this study, were to be submitted to the State Education Department on or before February 1, 1975. These include:

N-6	Deaf
Speech-Hearing	Blind
Special Education	7-9

RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS

Adelphi University
SUNY Albany
Alfred University
SUC Brockport
Dowling College
Fordham University
Ithaca College
Keuka College
Kirkland College
CUNY Herbert H. Lehman
LIU Southampton
Marymount College
Nazareth College
SUC New Paltz
SUC Potsdam
St. John's University
Syracuse University
Vassar College

NUMBER OF RESPONSES BY CATEGORY

Program Registration	Type of Institution	Number of Responding Institutions
1 year program registration	Public large	2
	Private large	3
	Small	3
4 year program registration	Public large	2
	Private large	3
	Small	3
1 and 4 year program registration	Public	1
	Private	1

	DEAN	TEACHER POLICY BOARD	PRINCIPAL POLICY BOARD	COLLEGE FACULTY POLICY BOARD	CHAIRPERSON POLICY BOARD	TASK CHAIRPERSON	PUBLIC SCHOOL TASK	COLLEGE TASK
1					x		x	x
2				x	x	x		x
3	x	x	x	x			x	
4		x	x		x	x	x	
5			x			x		x
6	x		x	x			x	x
7	x				x	x		
8	x		x				x	
9				x				
10								
11								
12		x						
13			x	x	x		x	x
14		x	x	x			x	
15		x	x		x	x	x	x
16								
17			x	x	x			
18		x		x		x		x

Responses per Institution by Role - Organizational Change

APPENDIX C

INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

POLICY BOARD

TASK FORCE

INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

Not Applicable		Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
____	1. CBTE should provide information for decision makers to decide whether a teaching candidate has sufficient competence to teach.	1	2	3	4	5
____	2. I approve of CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5
____	3. Members of the task force were given an inservice training program which was useful in helping them design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
____	4. CBTE is a more rational, systematic method for training teachers than the methods presently in use in most training organizations.	1	2	3	4	5
____	5. Administrators in this consortium's Institution of Higher Education approve of CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5
____	6. Sufficient assistance was given to the task force in designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
____	7. The State Education Department set up many rules and procedures for designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
____	8. I was able to influence the educational policies/decisions made by the task force.	1	2	3	4	5
____	9. The task force leader approves of CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5
____	10. The task force was given an orientation session which was useful in helping them understand the requirements involved in designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
____	11. I was able to influence the educational policies/decisions made by the policy board.	1	2	3	4	5
____	12. CBTE is a more accountable method for training teachers than the methods presently in use in most training institutions.	1	2	3	4	5
____	13. Members of the task force approve of CBTE.	1	2	3	4	
____	14. Sufficient funds were made available to the consortium for designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	

Not Applicable		Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
_____ 15.	I was able to influence the design of the CBTE plan for this IHE.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 16.	CBTE should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 17.	School district administrators in this consortium approve of CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 18.	I received feedback from others in regard to my performance/role in working to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 19.	CBTE should lead to more effective teacher performance.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 20.	School teachers' unions in this consortium approve of CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 21.	I received feedback from my own administrative superior in regard to my performance/role in working to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 22.	CBTE should ultimaterly lead to more effective school performance by students.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 23.	The initial results of CBTE in other States have been positive in terms of thier positive effect on the preparation of teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 24.	Decisions about what to put into the CBTE plan were made by task force members only.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 25.	I had freedom to control the events that influenced the design of a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 26.	Communication between the task force and the policy board focused on the exchange of information needed to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 27.	The CBTE plan which was designed by our task force should lead to more effective teacher performance.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 28.	The principles and components of CBTE are difficult to understand.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 29.	Decisions about how to design the CBTE plan were made by task force members only.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 30.	I was allowed little initiative in working to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5

Not Applicable		Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
_____ 31.	The CBTE plan which was designed by our task force should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 32.	It took too much time to design a CBTE plan for this IHE.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 33.	Decisions about how to design the CBTE plan were made by personnel other than those in the task force.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 34.	There were conflicting expectations held about my role in designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 35.	I was held accountable for my role in working to design a CBTE plan for the consortium.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 36.	Communication between the task force and me focused on the exchange of information needed to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 37.	Administrators in this consortium's IHE provided information about how to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 38.	The CBTE plan which was designed by our task force should provide information for decision makers to decide whether a teaching candidate has sufficient competence to teach.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 39.	It was easy to design a CBTE plan for this consortium.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 40.	Decisions about what to put into the CBTE plan were made by personnel other than those in the task force.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 41.	I received adequate compensation from my own organization for my role in working to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 42.	I was adequately involved in designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 43.	The CBTE plan which was designed by our task force should set up a more rational, systematic method for training teachers than the mehtods presently in use in this IHE.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 44.	When details for CBTE were first presented to me, the objectives of CBTE were clearly defined.	1	2	3	4	5

t Applicable		Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
___ 45.	I participated to the extent that I desired in making decisions about the design of a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 46.	When details of CBTE were first presented to me, research findings about the effects of CBTE in training teachers were not mentioned.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 47.	The task force was not kept well informed on the decisions and actions taken by the policy board in setting up a framework for the consortium.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 48.	Materials and supplies which were necessary for designing a CBTE plan were not provided on time.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 49.	Procedures for setting up a CBTE plan for this IHE were clearly defined by the policy board.	1	2	3	4	5

POLICY BOARD
ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

Not Applicable		Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
_____ 1.	CBTE should provide information for decision makers to decide whether a teaching candidate has sufficient competence to teach.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 2.	I approve of CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 3.	Members of the task force were given an inservice training program which was useful in helping them design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 4.	There were many rules and procedures describing the policy board's role in designing a CBTE program.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 5.	Members of the policy board were able to influence the educational policies/decisions made by the consortium group.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 6.	The policy board leader was concerned with what I thought about CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 7.	CBTE is a more rational, systematic method for training teacher than the method presently in use in most training organizations.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 8.	Administrators in this consortium's IHE approve of CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 9.	Sufficient assistance was given to the task force in designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 10.	The State Education Department set up many rules and procedures for designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 11.	I was able to influence the educational policies/decisions made by the policy board.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 12.	The policy board leader supported my efforts to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 13.	The policy board leader approves of CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 14.	The policy board was given an orientation session which was useful in helping me understand the requirements involved in designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	
_____ 15.	I had to communicate with the other members of the policy board to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	
_____ 16.	The policy board leader spent adequate time with me in helping me design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	

Not Applicable		Strongly AGREE				Strongly Disagree
____ 17.	CBTE is a more accountable method for training teachers than the methods presently in use in most training institutions.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 18.	Members of the policy board approve of CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 19.	Sufficient funds were made available to the consortium for designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 20.	I had to communicate with the policy board leader to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 21.	I was able to influence the design of the CBTE plan for this IHE.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 22.	The policy board leader provided information about how to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 23.	CBTE should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 24.	School district administrators in this consortium approve of CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 25.	I received feedback from others in regard to my performance/role in working to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 26.	I liked to work with the members of the policy board.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 27.	The policy board leader provided me with the necessary kinds of assistance for designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 28.	CBTE should lead to more effective teacher performance.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 29.	School teachers' unions in this consortium approve of CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 30.	I received feedback from my own administrative superior in regard to my performance/role in working to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 31.	Communication among policy board members focused on the exchange of information needed to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 32.	CBTE should ultimately lead to more effective school performance by students.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 33.	The initial results of CBTE in other states have been positive in terms of their positive effect on the preparation of teachers.	1	2	3	4	5

Not Applicable		Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
____ 34.	Decisions about what to put into the CBTE plan were made by task force members only.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 35.	I had little freedom to control the events that influenced the design of a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 36.	Communication between the task force and the policy board focused on the exchange of information needed to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 37.	The CBTE plan which was designed by our task force should lead to more effective teacher performance.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 38.	The principles and components of CBTE are difficult to understand.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 39.	Decisions about how to design the CBTE plan were made by task force members only.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 40.	I was allowed little initiative in working to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 41.	The CBTE plan which was designed by our task force should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 42.	It took too much time to design a CBTE plan for this IHE.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 43.	Decisions about how to design the CBTE plan were made by personnel other than those in the task force.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 44.	There were conflicting expectations held about the policy board's role in designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 45.	I was held accountable for my role in working to design a CBTE plan for the consortium.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 46.	Communication between the policy board and the administrators of the IHE focused on the exchange of information needed to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	
____ 47.	Administrators in this consortium's IHE provided information about how to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	

Not Applicable

		Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
____ 48.	The CBTE plan which was designed by our task force should provide information for decision makers to decide whether a teacher candidate had sufficient competence to teach.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 49.	It was easy to design a CBTE plan for this consortium.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 50.	Decisions about what to put into the CBTE plan were made by personnel other than those in the task force.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 51.	I received adequate compensation from my own organization for my role in working to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 52.	As a policy board member, I was adequately involved in designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 53.	The CBTE plan which was designed by our task force should set up a more rational, systematic method for training teachers than in the method presently in use in this IHE.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 54.	When details of CBTE were first presented to the policy board, the objectives of CBTE were clearly defined.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 55.	As a policy board member, I participated to the extent that I desired in making decisions about the design of a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 56.	When details of CBTE were first presented to the policy board, findings about the effects of CBTE in training teachers were not mentioned.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 57.	The policy board was not kept well informed on the decisions and actions taken by the task force in setting up a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 58.	Materials and supplies which were necessay for designing a CBTE plan were not provided on time.	1	2	3	4	5
____ 59.	Policy board meetings were scheduled when problems were encountered in designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5

TASK FORCE

ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

Not Applicable		Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
____	1. CBTE should provide information for decision makers to decide whether a teaching candidate has sufficient competence to teach.	1	2	3	4	5
____	2. I approve of CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5
____	3. Members of the task force were given an inservice training program which was useful in helping them design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
____	4. There were many rules and procedures describing the task force's role in designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
____	5. Members of the task force were able to influence the educational policies/decisions made by the consortium group.	1	2	3	4	5
____	6. The task force leader was concerned with what I thought about CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5
____	7. CBTE is a more rational, systematic methods for training teachers than the methods presently in use in most training organizations.	1	2	3	4	5
____	8. Administrators in this consortium's IHE approve of CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5
____	9. Sufficient assistance was given to the task force a designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
____	10. The State Education Department set up many rules and procedures for designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
____	11. I was able to influence the educational policies decisions made by the task force.	1	2	3	4	5
____	12. The task leader supported my efforts to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
____	13. The task force leader approves of CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5
____	14. The task force was given an orientation session which was useful in helping me understand the requirements involved in designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
____	15. I had to communicate with the other members of the task force to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
____	16. I was able to influence the educational policies/decisions made by the policy board.	1	2	3	4	5

t applicable

		Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
___ 17.	The task force leader spent adequate time with me in helping me design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 18.	CBTE is a more accountable method for training teachers than the methods presently in use in most training institutions.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 19.	Members of the task force approve of CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 20.	Sufficient funds were made abailable to the consortium for designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 21.	I had to communicate with the task force leader to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 22.	I was able to influence the design of the CBTE plan for this IHE.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 23.	The task force leader provided information about how to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 24.	CBTE should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 25.	School district administrators in this consortium approve of CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 26.	I received feedback from others in regard to my performance/role in working to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 27.	I had to communicate with administrators of the IHE to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 28.	I like to work with the members of the task force.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 29.	The task force leader provided me with the necessary kinds of assistance for designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 30.	CBTE should lead to more effective teacher performance.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 31.	Should teachers' unions in this consortium approve of CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 32.	I received feedback from my own administrative superior in regard to my performance/role in working to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 33.	I had to communicate with members of the policy board to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 34.	Communication among task force members focused on the exchange of information needed to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5

Not Applicable		Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
_____ 35.	Administrators in this consortium's IHE were concerned with the task force thought about CBTE.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 36.	CBTE should ultimately lead to more effective school performance by students.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 37.	The initial results of CBTE in other states have been positive in terms of their positive effect on the preparation of teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 38.	Decisions about what to put into the CBTE plan were made by task force members only.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 39.	I had little freedom to control the events that influenced the design of a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 40.	Communication between the task force and the policy board focused on the exchange of information needed to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 41.	Administrators in this consortium's IHE supported the task force's efforts to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 42.	The CBTE plan which was designed by our task force should lead to more effective teacher performance.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 43.	The principles and components of CBTE are difficult to understand.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 44.	Decisions about how to design the CBTE plan were made by task force members only.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 45.	I was allowed little initiative in working to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 46.	Administrators in this consortium's IHE spent adequate time with the task force in helping it design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 47.	The CBTE plan which was designed by our task force should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
_____ 48.	It took too much time to design a CBTE plan for this IHE.	1	2	3	4	
_____ 49.	Decisions about how to design the CBTE plan were made by personnel other than those in the task force.	1	2	3	4	
_____ 50.	There were confliciting expectations held about the task force's role in designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	

t Applicable

		Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
___ 51.	I was held accountable for my role in working to design a CBTE plan for the consortium.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 52.	Communication between the task force and the administrators of the focused on the exchange of information needed to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 53.	Administrators in this consortium's IHE provided information about how to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 54.	The CBTE plan which designed by our task force should provide information for decision makers to decide whether a teaching candidate has sufficient competence to teach.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 55.	It was easy to design a CBTE plan for this consortium.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 56.	Decisions about what to put into the CBTE plan were made by personnel other than those in the task force.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 57.	I received adequate compensation from my own organization for my role in working to design a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 58.	As a task force member, I was adequately involved in designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 59.	Administrators in this consortium's IHE provided the task force with the necessary kinds of assistance for designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 60.	The CBTE plan which was designed by our task force should set up a more rational, systematic methodfor training teachers than the method presently in use in this IHE.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 61.	When details of CBTE were first presented to the task force, the objectives of CBTE were clearly defined.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 62.	As a task force member, I participated to the extent that I desired in making decisions about the design of a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 63.	When details of CBTE were first presented to the task force, research finding about the effects of CBTE in training teachers were not mentioned.	1	2	3	4	5
___ 64.	The task force was not kept well informed on the decisions and actions taken by the policy board in setting up a framework for the con-	1	2	3	4	5

Not Applicable		Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
_____	65. Materials and supplies which were necessary for designing a CBTE plan were not provided on time.	1	2	3	4	5
_____	66. Procedures for setting up a CBTE plan for this IHE were clearly defined by the policy board.	1	2	3	4	5
_____	67. Task force meetings were scheduled when problems were encountered in designing a CBTE plan.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX D

Mean Perceptions of Organizational Change - IHE
Policy Board
Task Force

APPENDIX D (1)

MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE -- IHE QUESTIONNAIRE

Organizational Change Category	Standard Deviation	Mean
1. CBTE should provide sufficient teacher education information for teacher trainers.	1.177	2.053
2. I approve of CBTE.	.945	2.000
3. Task force members were given a useful CBTE design inservice training program.	1.071	3.421
4. CBTE is a more rational, systematic method for training teachers.	1.261	2.421
5. Administrators in this IHE approve of CBTE.	.946	2.000
6. Sufficient CBTE design assistance was given to the task force.	1.129	2.947
7. The State Education Department set up many CBTE design rules and procedures.	1.429	3.474
8. I was able to influence the task force's educational policies/ decisions.	1.261	2.421
9. The task force leader approves of CBTE.	.848	2.053
10. The task force was given an orientation session which helped them understand the CBTE design requirements.	1.071	2.579
11. I was able to influence the policy board's educational policies/ decisions.	1.216	2.421
12. CBTE is a more accountable method for training teachers.	1.195	2.263
13. Task force members approve of CBTE.	1.261	2.421
14. Sufficient CBTE design funds were made available to the consortium.	1.098	4.263
15. I was able to influence the CBTE design.	1.147	2.263
16. CBTE should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.	1.250	2.316
17. This consortium's school district administrators approve of CBTE.	.955	2.632
18. I received feedback from others in regard to my CBTE design performance/role.	1.264	2.526
19. CBTE should lead to more effective teacher performance.	1.212	2.368
20. This consortium's school teachers' unions approve of CBTE.	1.071	3.421
21. I received feedback from my own administrative superior in regard to my performance/role.	1.565	2.684
22. CBTE should ultimately lead to more effective student performance.	1.264	2.474
23. The initial results of CBTE in the preparation of teachers in other states have been positive.	.772	3.474
24. Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by task force members only.	1.305	3.421
25. I had freedom to control the CBTE design events.	1.414	3.000
26. Communication between the task force and the policy board focused on the exchange of CBTE-design information.	.958	2.842
27. Our CBTE plan should lead to more effective teacher performance.	.806	2.263
28. CBTE's principles and components are difficult to understand.	1.344	3.158
29. Decisions about designing the CBTE plan were made by task force members only.	1.376	3.684

APPENDIX D (2)

MEAN PERCEPTION OF ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE -- POLICY BOARD QUESTIONNAIRE

Organizational Change Category	Standard Deviation	Mean
1. CBTE should provide sufficient teacher education information for teacher trainers.	.651	1.440
2. I approve of CBTE.	.759	1.920
3. Task force members were given a useful CBTE design inservice training program.	1.275	3.120
4. There were many rules and procedures describing the policy board's design role.	1.242	3.280
5. Members of the policy board were able to influence the consortium's educational policies/decisions.	1.020	2.040
6. The policy board leader was concerned with what I thought about CBTE.	.779	1.760
7. CBTE is a more rational and systematic method for training teachers.	1.061	2.280
8. Administrators in this IHE approve of CBTE.	.935	1.960
9. Sufficient CBTE design assistance was given to the task force.	1.021	2.280
10. The State Education Department set up many CBTE design rules and procedures.	1.159	3.480
11. I was able to influence the policy board's educational policies/ decisions.	.938	2.040
12. The policy board leader supported my CBTE design efforts.	.943	1.840
13. The policy board leader approves of CBTE.	.746	1.840
14. The policy board was given an orientation session which helped me understand the CBTE design requirements.	1.249	2.680
15. I had to communicate with the other policy board members to design a CBTE plan.	1.215	2.920
16. The policy board leader spent adequate time with me.	1.227	2.560
17. CBTE is a more accountable method for training teachers.	1.054	1.880
18. Policy board members approve of CBTE.	.759	1.920
19. Sufficient CBTE design funds were made available to the consortium.	1.384	3.800
20. I had to communicate with the policy board leader to design a CBTE plan.	.963	2.520
21. I was able to influence the CBTE design.	.841	1.960
22. The policy board leader provided CBTE design information.	1.291	2.400
23. CBTE should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.	.978	2.040
24. This consortium's school district administrators approve of CBTE.	.833	1.880
25. I received feedback from others in regard to my CBTE design performance/role.	1.085	2.520
26. I liked to work with the policy board members.	.663	1.760
27. The policy board leader provided me with the necessary kinds of design assistance.	1.254	2.360
28. CBTE should lead to more effective teacher performance.	1.222	2.080
29. This consortium's school teachers' unions approve of CBTE.	1.137	2.720
30. I received feedback from my own administrative superior in regard to my CBTE design performance/role.	1.491	2.840

APPENDIX D (1) (continued)

Organizational Change Category	Standard Deviation	Mean
30. I was allowed little initiative in desiging a CBTE plan.	.885	4.316
31. Our CBTE plan should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.	1.216	2.421
32. It took too much time to design a CBTE plan.	1.224	2.947
33. Decisions about designing the CBTE plan were made by personnel outside the task force.	1.761	3.105
34. There were conflicting expectations held about my CBTE design role.	1.212	3.632
35. I was held accountable for my CBTE design role.	1.307	2.474
36. Communication between the task force and me focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.	.872	2.263
37. IHE administrators provided CBTE design information.	1.410	2.895
38. Our CBTE plan should provide useful teacher training information.	.780	2.053
39. It was easy to design a CBTE plan.	1.015	4.158
40. Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by personnel outside the task force.	1.493	3.316
41. I received adequate compensation from my own organization for my CBTE design role.	1.228	3.789
42. I was adequately involved in designing a CBTE plan.	.994	1.895
43. Our CBTE plan should set up a more rational, systematic method for training teachers.	1.172	2.526
44. When CBTE details were first presented to me its objectives were clearly defined.	1.398	3.211
45. I participated to the extent that I desired in making CBTE design decisions.	1.410	2.105
46. When CBTE details were first presented to me, findings about its effects in training teachers were not mentioned.	1.447	2.263
47. The task force was not kept well informed on the CBTE design decisions and actions taken by the policy board.	1.134	3.789
48. Materials and supplies which were necessary for designing a CBTE plan were not provided on time.	1.383	3.368
49. Procedures for setting up a CBTE plan were clearly defined by the policy board.	1.447	2.737

TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS = 19

APPENDIX D (3)

MEAN PERCEPTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE -- TASK FORCE QUESTIONNAIRE

Organizational Change Category	Standard Deviation	Mean
1. CBTE should provide sufficient teacher education information for teacher trainers.	.814	1.563
2. I approve of CBTE.	.834	1.812
3. Task force members were given a useful CBTE design inservice training program.	1.211	3.000
4. There were many rules and procedures describing the task force's CBTE design role.	1.031	3.458
5. Members of the task force were able to influence the consortium's educational policies/decisions.	.772	2.062
6. The task force leader was concerned with what I thought about CBTE.	.998	2.062
7. CBTE is a more rational and systematic method for training teachers.	1.025	2.125
8. Administrators in this IHE approve of CBTE.	.574	2.062
9. Sufficient CBTE design assistance was given the task force.	1.000	2.250
10. The State Education Department set up many CBTE design rules and procedures.	1.195	3.687
11. I was able to influence the task force's educational policies/ decisions.	.619	2.375
12. The task leader supported my CBTE design efforts.	.574	1.937
13. The task force leader approves of CBTE.	.719	2.125
14. The task force was given an orientation session which helped me understand the CBTE design requirements.	1.209	2.437
15. I had to communicate with the other task force members to design a CBTE plan.	1.063	2.062
16. I was able to influence the policy board's educational policies/ decisions.	1.095	2.500
17. The task force leader spent adequate time with me.	.816	2.000
18. CBTE is a more accountable method for training teachers.	1.063	1.937
19. Task force members approve of CBTE.	.793	2.312
20. Sufficient CBTE design funds were made available to the consortium.	1.125	3.750
21. I had to communicate with the task force leader to design a CBTE plan.	1.078	2.312
22. I was able to influence the CBTE design.	.873	2.312
23. The task force leader provided CBTE design information.	.727	2.437
24. CBTE should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.	.655	1.812
25. This consortium's school district administrators approve of CBTE.	1.109	2.188
26. I received feedback from others in regard to my CBTE design performance.	.892	2.437
27. I had to communicate with IHE administrators to design a CBTE plan.	1.223	2.813
28. I like to work with the task force members.	.772	1.937
29. The task force leader provided me with the necessary kinds of CBTE design assistance.	.957	2.125
30. CBTE should lead to more effective teacher performance.	.619	1.875

APPENDIX D (2) (continued)

Organizational Change Category	Standard Deviation	Mean
31. Communication among policy board members focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.	1.208	2.280
32. CBTE should ultimately lead to more effective student performance.	1.282	2.320
33. The initial results of CBTE in the preparation of teachers in other states have been positive.	.889	3.040
34. Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by task force members only.	1.615	3.240
35. I had little freedom to control CBTE design events.	1.207	4.040
36. Communication between the task force and the policy board focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.	.833	2.120
37. Our CBTE plan should lead to more effective teacher performance.	1.314	2.320
38. CBTE's principles and components are difficult to understand.	1.052	3.760
39. Decisions about designing the CBTE plan were made by task force members only.	1.387	3.560
40. I was allowed little initiative in designing a CBTE plan.	1.068	4.160
41. Our CBTE plan should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.	1.214	2.160
42. It took too much time to design a CBTE plan.	1.417	3.440
43. Decisions about designing the CBTE plan were made by personnel outside the task force.	1.227	3.560
44. There were conflicting expectations held about the policy board's CBTE design role.	1.003	3.560
45. I was held accountable for my CBTE design role.	1.308	2.720
46. Communication between the policy board and IHE administrators focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.	1.075	2.640
47. IHE administrators provided CBTE design information.	1.159	2.520
48. Our CBTE plan should provide teacher training information.	1.077	2.080
49. It was easy to design a CBTE plan.	1.166	3.880
50. Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by personnel other than those in the task force.	1.295	3.480
51. I received adequate compensation from my own organization for my CBTE design role.	1.551	3.640
52. As a policy board member, I was adequately involved in designing a CBTE plan.	.852	1.680
53. Our CBTE plan should set up a more rational, systematic method for training teachers.	.978	2.040
54. When CBTE details were first presented to the policy board, its objectives were clearly defined.	1.434	2.840
55. As a policy board member, I participated to the extent that I desired in making CBTE design decisions.	.900	1.680
56. When CBTE details were first presented to the policy board, findings about its effects in teacher trainings were not mentioned.	1.528	2.800
57. The policy board was not kept well informed on the CBTE design decisions and actions taken by the task force.	1.256	4.080
58. Materials and supplies which were necessary for designing a CBTE plan were not provided on time.	1.323	3.800
59. Policy board meetings were scheduled when design problems were encountered	1.155	2.200

APPENDIX D (3) (continued)

Organizational Change Category	Standard Deviation	Mean
31. This consortium's school teachers' unions approve of CBTE.	.772	2.062
32. I received feedback from my own administrative superior in regard to my CBTE design performance/role.	1.031	2.562
33. I had to communicate with policy board members to design a CBTE plan.	1.250	2.687
34. Communication among task force members focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.	.772	1.937
35. IHE administrators were concerned with what the task force thought about CBTE.	.957	2.375
36. CBTE should ultimately lead to more effective student performance.	.772	1.937
37. The initial results of CBTE in the preparation of teachers in other states have been positive.	1.088	3.125
38. Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by task force members only.	1.436	3.062
39. I had little freedom to control CBTE design events.	.957	3.875
40. Communication between the task force and the policy board focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.	.793	2.312
41. IHE administrators supported the task force's CBTE design efforts.	.574	2.062
42. Our CBTE plan should lead to more effective teacher performance.	.655	1.812
43. CBTE's principles and components are difficult to understand.	1.183	3.250
44. Decisions about designing the CBTE plan were made by task force members only.	1.310	3.625
45. I was allowed little initiative in designing a CBTE plan.	.873	4.312
46. IHE administrators spent adequate time with the task force.	1.109	2.813
47. Our CBTE plan should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.	.619	1.875
48. It took too much time to design a CBTE plan.	1.459	3.562
49. Decisions about designing the CBTE plan were made by personnel outside the task force.	1.014	3.687
50. There were conflicting expectations held about the task force's CBTE design role.	.806	3.125
51. I was held accountable for my CBTE design role.	.806	2.125
52. Communication between the task force and IHE administrators focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.	1.000	2.750
53. IHE administrators provided CBTE design information.	1.310	3.125
54. Our CBTE plan should provide useful teacher training information.	1.088	1.875
55. It was easy to design a CBTE plan.	.885	4.125
56. Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by personnel other than those in the task force.	1.125	3.250
57. I received adequate compensation from my own organization for my CBTE design role.	1.025	3.625
58. As a task force member, I was adequately involved in designing a CBTE plan.	1.153	2.437
59. IHE administrators provided the task force with the necessary kinds of CBTE design information.	.619	2.875
60. Our CBTE plan should set up a more rational and systematic method for training teachers.	.632	2.500

APPENDIX D (3) (continued)

Organizational Change Category	Standard Deviation	Mean
61. When CBTE details were first presented to the task force, its objectives were clearly defined.	.816	3.000
62. As a task force member, I participated to the extent that I desired in making CBTE design decisions.	.873	2.312
63. When CBTE details were first presented to the task force, findings about its effects in training teachers were not mentioned.	1.031	2.562
64. The task force was not kept well informed on the CBTE design decisions and actions taken by the policy board.	.814	3.438
65. Materials and supplies which were necessary for designing a CBTE plan were not provided on time.	.957	3.625
66. Procedures for setting up a CBTE plan were clearly defined by the policy board.	.957	2.625
67. Task force meetings were scheduled when design problems were encountered.	.814	2.437

TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS = 16

APPENDIX D(4)

Mean Group Perceptions of Organizational Change Variables ---
Across All Questionnaires

	Organizational Change Category	Mean Group Perceptions		
		IHE	Policy Board	Task Force
1.	CBTE should provide sufficient teacher education information for teacher trainers.	2.053	1.440	1.563
2.	I approve of CBTE.	2.000	1.920	1.812
3.	Task force members were given a useful CBTE design inservice training program.	3.421	3.720	3.000
4.	There were many rules and procedures describing our group's CBTE design role*	-	3.280	3.458
5.	Members of our group were able to influence the consortium's educational policies/decisions.	-	2.040	2.062
6.	Our group's leader was concerned with what I thought about CBTE*	-	1.760	2.062
7.	CBTE is a more rational and systematic method for training teachers.	2.421	2.280	2.125
8.	IHE administrators approve of CBTE.	2.000	1.960	2.062
9.	Sufficient CBTE design assistance was given to the task force.	2.947	2.280	2.250
10.	The State Education Department set up many CBTE design rules and procedures.	3.474	3.480	3.687
11.	I was able to influence our group's educational policies/decisions.*	2.421	2.040	2.375
12.	Our group leader supported my CBTE design efforts.*	-	1.840	1.937
13.	Our group leader approves of CBTE.*	2.053	1.840	2.125
14.	Our group was given an orientation session which helped me understand the CBTE design requirements.*	2.579	2.680	2.437
15.	I had to communicate with the other members of my group to design a CBTE plan.*	-	2.320	2.062
16.	I was able to influence the policy board's educational policies/ decisions.	2.421	-	2.500
17.	Our group leader spent adequate CBTE design time with me.*	-	2.560	2.000
18.	CBTE is a more accountable method for training teachers.	2.263	1.880	1.937
19.	Our group's members approve of CBTE.*	2.421	1.920	2.312
20.	Sufficient CBTE design funds were made available to the consortium.	4.263	3.800	3.750
21.	I had to communicate with our group's leader to design a CBTE plan.*	-	2.520	2.312

APPENDIX D (4) - continued

Organizational Change Category	Mean Group Perceptions		
	IHE	Policy Board	Task Force
22. I was able to influence the design of the CBTE plan.	2.263	1.960	2.312
23. Our group leader provided CBTE design information.*	-	2.400	2.437
24. CBTE should lead to more effective teacher preparation.	2.316	2.040	1.812
25. Consortium school district administrators approve of CBTE.	2.632	1.880	2.188
26. I received feedback from others in regard to my CBTE design performance/role.	2.526	2.520	2.437
27. I had to communicate with IHE administrators to design a CBTE plan.	-	-	2.813
28. I liked to work with our group's members.*	-	1.760	1.937
29. Our group leader provided me with the necessary kinds of CBTE design assistance.*	-	2.360	2.125
30. CBTE should lead to more effective teacher performance.	2.368	2.080	1.875
31. Consortium school teachers unions approve of CBTE.	3.421	2.720	2.062
32. I received feedback from my own administrative superior in regard to my CBTE design performance/role.	2.684	2.840	2.562
33. I had to communicate with policy board members to design a CBTE plan.	-	-	2.687
34. Communication among our group's members focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.*	-	2.280	1.937
35. IHE administrators were concerned with what the task force thought about CBTE.	-	-	2.375
36. CBTE should ultimately lead to more effective student school performance.	2.474	2.320	1.937
37. The initial results of CBTE in teacher preparation in other states have been positive.	3.474	3.040	3.125
38. Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by task force members only.	3.421	3.240	3.062
39. I had little freedom to control the CBTE design events.	3.000	4.040	3.875
40. Communication between the task force and the policy board focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.	2.842	2.120	2.312
41. IHE administrators supported the task force's CBTE design efforts.	-	-	2.062
42. Our CBTE plan should lead to more effective teacher performance.	2.263	2.320	1.812

APPENDIX D (4) - Continued

Organizational Change Category	Mean Group Perceptions		
	IHE	Policy Board	Task Force
43. CBTE's principles and components are difficult to understand.	3.158	3.760	3.250
44. Decisions about designing the CBTE plan were made by task force members only.	3.684	3.560	3.625
45. I was allowed little initiative in designing a CBTE plan.	4.316	4.160	4.312
46. IHE administrators spent adequate CBTE design time with the task force.	-	-	2.813
47. Our CBTE plan should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.	2.421	2.160	1.875
48. It took too much time to design a CBTE plan.	2.947	3.440	3.562
49. Decisions about designing the CBTE plan were made by personnel outside the task force.	3.105	3.560	3.687
50. There were conflicting expectations held about my (or my group's) CBTE design role.*	3.632	3.560	3.125
51. I was held accountable for my CBTE design role.	2.474	2.720	2.125
52. Communication between the task force and the IHE administrators focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.	2.263	2.640	2.750
53. IHE administrators provided CBTE design information.	2.895	2.520	3.125
54. Our CBTE plan should provide sufficient teacher education information for teacher trainers.	2.053	2.080	1.875
55. It was easy to design a CBTE plan.	4.158	3.880	4.125
56. Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by personnel outside the task force.	3.316	3.480	3.250
57. I received adequate compensation from my own organization for my CBTE design role.	3.789	3.640	3.625
58. I was adequately involved in designing a CBTE plan.	1.895	1.680	2.437
59. IHE administrators provided the task force with the necessary kinds of CBTE design assistance.	-	-	2.875
60. Our CBTE plan should set up a more rational, systematic method for training teachers.	2.526	2.040	2.500
61. When CBTE details were first presented to me (or my group), its objectives were clearly defined.	3.211	2.840	3.000

APPENDIX D(4) - continued

Organizational Change Category	Mean Group Perceptions		
	IHE	Policy Board	Task Force
62. I participated to the extent that I desired in making CBTE design decisions.	2.105	1.680	2.312
63. When CBTE details were first presented to me (or my group) research findings about its effects in training teachers were not mentioned.	2.263	2.800	2.562
64. Our group was not well kept informed on the CBTE design decisions and actions taken by the other group.	3.789	4.080	3.438
65. Necessary CBTE design materials and supplies were not provided on time.	3.368	3.800	3.625
66. Procedures for setting up a CBTE plan were clearly defined by the policy board.	2.737	-	2.625
67. Task force meetings were scheduled when problems were encountered in designing a CBTE plan.	-	2.200	2.437

TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS = 61

* Our group's (decisions, etc.) = IHE -- Task Force
Policy Board -- Policy Board
Task Force -- Task Force

Response Key: 1 = strongly agree
2 = agree
3 = neither agree nor disagree
4 = disagree
5 = strongly disagree

APPENDIX E

Perceptions of Organizational Change Variables

IHE
Policy Board
Task Force

APPENDIX E (1)

IHE RESPONDENT PERCEPTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE VARIABLES

ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE VARIABLES	RESPONSES BY FREQUENCY/PERCENT				
	1	2	3	4	5
1. CBTE should provide sufficient teacher education information for teacher trainers	8/42.1	5/26.3	4/21.1	1/5.3	1/5.3
2. I approve of CBTE.	7/36.8	6/31.6	5/26.3	1/5.3	-/--
3. Task force members were given a useful CBTE design inservice training program.	-/--	4/21.1	7/36.8	4/21.1	4/21.1
4. CBTE is a more rational, systematic method for training teachers.	6/3.6	3/15.8	8/42.1	-/--	2/10.5
5. Administrators in this IHE approve of CBTE.	4/21.1	7/36.8	6/31.6	2/10.5	-/--
6. Sufficient CBTE design assistance was given to the task force.	2/10.5	4/21.1	8/42.1	3/15.8	2/10.5
7. The State Education Department set up many CBTE design rules and procedures.	3/15.8	2/10.5	2/10.5	7/37.8	5/26.3
8. I was able to influence the task force's educational policies/decisions.	5/26.3	6/31.6	5/26.3	1/5.3	2/10.5
9. The task force leader approves of CBTE.	6/31.6	6/31.6	7/36.8	-/--	-/--
10. The task force was given an orientation session which helped them understand the CBTE design requirements.	3/15.8	6/31.6	7/36.8	2/10.5	1/5.3
11. I was able to influence the policy board's educational policies/decisions.	4/21.1	8/42.1	4/21.1	1/5.3	2/10.5
12. CBTE is a more accountable method for training teachers.	7/36.8	3/15.8	7/36.8	1/5.3	1/5.3
13. Task force members approve of CBTE.	5/26.3	6/31.6	5/26.3	1/5.3	2/10.5
14. Sufficient CBTE design funds were made available to the consortium.	-/--	2/10.5	3/15.8	2/10.5	12/63.2
15. I was able to influence the CBTE design.	6/31.6	5/26.3	6/31.6	1/5.3	1/5.3
16. CBTE should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.	6/31.6	5/26.3	6/31.6	-/--	2/10.5
17. This consortium's school district administrators approve of CBTE.	2/10.5	6/31.6	9/47.4	1/5.3	1/5.3
18. I received feedback from others in regard to my CBTE design performance/role.	4/21.1	7/36.8	4/31.1	2/10.5	2/10.5
19. CBTE should lead to more effective teacher performance.	5/26.3	6/31.6	6/31.6	-/--	2/10.5
20. This consortium's school teachers' unions approve of CBTE.	-/--	3/15.8	10/52.6	1/5.3	5/26.3
21. I received feedback from my own administrative superior in regard to my performance/role.	6/31.6	4/21.1	3/15.8	2/10.5	4/21.1
22. CBTE should ultimately lead to more effective student performance.	5/26.3	5/26.3	6/31.6	1/5.3	2/10.5
23. The initial results of CBTE in the preparation of teachers in other states have been positive.	-/--	-/--	13/68.4	3/15.8	3/15.8

Appendix E(1) continued

ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE VARIABLES	RESPONSES BY FREQUENCY/PERCENT				
	1	2	3	4	5
24. Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by task force members only.	2/10.5	3/15.8	3/15.8	7/36.8	4/21.1
25. I had freedom to control the CBTE design events.	3/15.8	4/21.1	7/36.8	-/--	5/26.3
26. Communication between the task force and the policy board focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.	2/10.5	4/21.1	8/42.1	5/26.3	-/--
27. Our CBTE plan should lead to more effective teacher performance.	4/21.1	6/31.6	9/47.4	-/--	-/--
28. CBTE's principles and components are difficult to understand.	2/10.5	6/31.6	1/5.3	7/36.8	3/15.8
29. Decisions about designing the CBTE plan were made by task force members only.	2/10.5	2/10.5	3/15.8	5/26.3	7/36.8
30. I was allowed little initiative in designing a CBTE plan.	-/--	-/--	5/26.3	3/15.8	11/57.9
31. Our CBTE plan should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.	5/26.3	5/26.3	7/36.8	-/--	2/10.5
32. It took too much time to design a CBTE plan.	3/15.8	3/15.8	7/36.8	4/21.1	2/10.5
33. Decisions about designing the CBTE plan were made by personnel outside the task force.	6/31.6	2/10.5	2/10.5	2/10.5	7/36.8
34. There were conflicting expectations held about my CBTE design role.	-/--	4/21.1	6/31.6	2/10.5	7/37.8
35. I was held accountable for my CBTE design role.	5/26.3	6/31.6	4/21.1	2/10.5	2/10.5
36. Communication between the task force and me focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.	4/21.1	7/36.8	7/36.8	1/5.3	-/--
37. IHE administrators provided CBTE design information.	3/15.8	6/31.6	4/21.1	2/10.5	4/21.1
38. Our CBTE plan should provide useful teacher training information.	5/26.3	8/42.1	6/31.6	-/--	-/--
39. It was easy to design a CBTE plan.	-/--	2/10.5	2/10.5	6/31.6	9/47.4
40. Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by personnel outside the task force.	3/15.8	3/15.8	4/21.1	3/15.8	6/31.6
41. I received adequate compensation from my own organization for my CBTE design role.	1/5.3	2/10.5	4/21.1	5/26.3	7/36.8
42. I was adequately involved in designing a CBTE plan.	8/42.1	7/36.8	2/10.5	2/10.5	-/--
43. Our CBTE plan should set up a more rational, systematic method for training teachers.	4/21.1	5/26.3	8/42.1	-/--	2/10.5
44. When CBTE details were first presented to me its objectives were clearly defined.	3/15.8	3/15.8	4/21.1	5/26.3	4/21.1
45. I participated to the extent that I desired in making CBTE design decisions.	8/42.1	7/36.8	1/5.3	-/--	3/15.8

Appendix E (1) continued

ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE VARIABLES	RESPONSES BY FREQUENCY/PERCENT				
	1	2	3	4	5
46. When CBTE details were first presented to me, findings about its effects in training teachers were not mentioned.	9/47.4	2/10.5	4/21.1	2/10.5	2/10.5
47. The task force was not kept well informed on the CBTE design decisions and actions taken by the policy board.	1/5.3	1/5.3	5/26.3	6/31.6	6/31.6
48. Materials and supplies which were necessary for designing a CBTE plan were not provided on time.	3/15.8	2/10.5	3/15.8	7/36.8	4/21.1
49. Procedures for setting up a CBTE plan were clearly defined by the policy board.	6/31.6	1/5.3	7/36.8	2/10.5	3/15.8

TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS 19

Response Key:

1 = Strongly Agree

2 = Agree

3 = Neither agree nor disagree

4 = Disagree

5 = Strongly Disagree

APPENDIX E (2)

POLICY BOARD RESPONDENT PERCEPTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE VARIABLES

ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE VARIABLES	RESPONSES BY FREQUENCY/PERCENT				
	1	2	3	4	5
1. CBTE should provide sufficient teacher education information for teacher trainers.	16/64.0	7/28.0	2/8.0	-/--	-/--
2. I approve of CBTE.	8/32.0	11/44.0	6/24.0	-/--	-/--
3. Task force members were given a useful CBTE design inservice training program.	2/8.0	2/8.0	6/24.0	6/24.0	9/36.0
4. There were many rules and procedures describing the policy board's design role.	3/12.0	3/12.0	7/28.0	8/32.0	4/16.0
5. Members of the policy board were able to influence the consortium's educational policies/decisions.	9/36.0	8/32.0	7/28.0	-/--	1/4.0
6. The policy board leader was concerned with what I thought about CBTE.	11/44.0	9/36.0	5/20.0	-/--	-/--
7. CBTE is a more rational and systematic method for training teachers.	6/24.0	10/40.0	6/24.0	2/8.0	1/4.0
8. Administrators in this IHE approve of CBTE.	10/40.0	7/28.0	7/28.0	1/4.0	-/--
9. Sufficient CBTE design assistance was given to the Task Force.	6/24.0	10/40.0	5/20.0	4/16.0	-/--
10. The State Education Department set up many CBTE design rules and procedures.	1/4.0	4/16.0	8/32.0	6/24.0	6/24.0
11. I was able to influence the policy board's educational policies/decisions.	10/40.00	4/16.0	11/44.0	-/--	-/--
12. The policy board leader supported my CBTE design efforts.	9/36.0	9/36.0	6/24.0	1/4.0	-/--
13. The policy board leader approves of CBTE.	9/86.0	11/44.0	5/20.0	-/--	-/--
14. The policy board was given an orientation session which helped me understand the CBTE design requirements.	5/20.00	6/24.0	9/36.0	2/8.0	3/12.0
15. I had to communicate with the other policy board members to design a CBTE plan.	7/28.0	9/36.0	5/20.00	2/8.0	2/8.0
16. The policy board leader spent adequate time with me.	7/28.0	3/12.0	11/44.0	2/8.0	2/8.0
17. CBTE is a more accountable method for training teachers.	12/48.0	7/28.0	3/12.0	3/12.0	-/--
18. Policy board members approve of CBTE.	8/32.0	11/44.0	6/24.0	-/--	-/--
19. Sufficient CBTE design funds were made available to the consortium.	2/8.0	4/16.0	2/8.0	6/24.0	11/44.0
20. I had to communicate with the policy board leader to design a CBTE plan.	5/2.0	4/16.0	15/60.0	-/--	1/4.0
21. I was able to influence the CBTE design.	8/32.0	11/44.0	5/20.0	1/4.0	-/--
22. The policy board leader provided CBTE design information.	8/32.0	6/24.0	6/24.0	3/12.0	2/8.0
23. CBTE should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.	9/36.0	8/32.0	6/24.0	2/8.0	-/--

Appendix E(2) Continued

ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE VARIABLES	RESPONSES BY FREQUENCY/PERCENT 1	2	3	4	5
46. Communication between the policy board and IHE administrators focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.	4/16.0	6/24.0	12/48.0	1/4.0	2/8.0
47. IHE administrators provided CBTE design information.	6/24.0	5/20.0	11/44.0	1/4.0	2/8.0
48. Our CBTE plan should provide teacher training information.	8/32.0	11/44.0	3/12.0	2/8.0	1/4.0
49. It was easy to design a CBTE plan.	1/4.0	2/8.0	6/24.0	6/24.0	10/40.0
50. Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by personnel other than those in the task force.	1/4.0	2/8.0	9/36.0	7/28.0	6/24.0
51. I received adequate compensation from my own organization for my CBTE design role.	2/8.0	2/8.0	8/32.0	1/4.0	12/48.0
52. As a policy board member, I was adequately involved in designing a CBTE plan.	11/44.0	8/32.0	6/24.0	-/--	-/--
53. Our CBTE plan should set up a more rational, systematic method for training teachers.	7/28.0	8/32.0	9/36.0	1/4.0	-/--
54. When CBTE details were first presented to the policy board, its objectives were clearly defined.	4/16.0	5/20.0	8/32.0	4/16.0	4/16.0
55. As a policy board member, I participated to the extent that I desired in making CBTE design decisions.	11/44.0	9/36.0	4/16.0	1/4.0	-/--
56. When CBTE details were first presented to the policy board, findings about its effects in teacher trainings were not mentioned.	6/24.0	2/8.0	10/40.0	2/8.0	5/20.0
57. The policy board was not kept well informed on the CBTE design decisions and actions taken by the task force.	-/--	1/4.0	6/24.0	5/20.0	13/52.0
58. Materials and supplies which were necessary for designing a CBTE plan were not provided on time.	1/4.0	-/--	9/36.0	5/20.0	10/40.0
59. Policy board meetings were scheduled when design problems were encountered.	6/24.0	9/36.0	7/28.0	2/8.0	1/4.0

TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS = 25

Response Key:

1 = Strongly Agree

2 = Agree

3 = Neither agree nor disagree

4 = Disagree

5 = Strongly disagree

APPENDIX E (3)

TASK FORCE RESPONDENT PERCEPTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE VARIABLES

Organizational Change Variables	Responses By Frequency/Percent				
	1	2	3	4	5
1. CBTE should provide sufficient teacher education information for teacher trainers.	10/62.5	3/18.8	3/18/8	-/--	-/--
2. I approve of CBTE.	7/43.8	5/31.3	4/25.0	-/--	-/--
3. Task force members were given a useful CBTE design inservice training program.	1/6.3	5/31.3	6/37.5	1/6.3	3/18.8
4. There were many rules and procedures describing the task force's CBTE design role.	-/--	3/18.8	6/37.5	4/25.0	3/18.8
5. Members of the task force were able to influence the consortium's educational policies/decisions.	4/25.0	7/43.8	5/31.3	-/--	-/--
6. The task force leader was concerned with what I thought about CBTE.	5/31.3	7/43.8	2/12.5	2/12.5	-/--
7. CBTE is a more rational and systematic method for training teachers.	4/25.0	8/50.0	3/18.8	-/--	1/6.3
8. Administrators in this IHE approve of CBTE.	2/12.5	11/68.8	3/18.8	-/--	-/--
9. Sufficient CBTE design assistance was given the task force.	3/18.8	8/50.0	4/25.0	-/--	1/6.3
10. The State Education Department set up many CBTE design rules and procedures.	-/--	4/25.0	2/12.5	5/31.3	5/31.3
11. I was able to influence the task force's educational policies/decisions.	1/6.3	8/50.0	7/43.8	-/--	-/--
12. The task leader supported my CBTE design efforts.	3/18.8	11/68.8	2/12.5	-/--	-/--
13. The task force leader approves of CBTE.	3/18.8	8/50.0	5/31.3	-/--	-/--
14. The task force was given an orientation session which helped me understand the CBTE design requirements.	3/18.8	7/43.8	4/25.0	-/--	2/12.5
15. I had to communicate with the other task force members to design a CBTE plan.	5/31.3	7/43.8	3/18.8	-/--	1/6.3
16. I was able to influence the policy board's educational policies/decisions.	2/12.5	8/50.0	3/18.8	2/12.5	1/6.3
17. The task force leader spent adequate time with me.	5/31.3	6/37.5	5/31.3	-/--	-/--
18. CBTE is a more accountable method for training teachers.	6/37.5	7/43.8	2/12.5	-/--	1/6.3
19. Task force members approve of CBTE.	3/18.8	5/31.3	8/50.0	-/--	-/--
20. Sufficient CBTE design funds were made available to the consortium.	-/--	2/12.5	6/37.5	2/12.5	6/37.5
21. I had to communicate with the task force leader to design a CBTE plan.	3/18.8	8/50.0	3/18.8	1/6.3	1/6.3
22. I was able to influence the CBTE design.	3/18.8	6/37.5	6/37.5	1/6.3	-/--
23. The task force leader provided CBTE design information.	2/12.5	5/13.3	9/56.3	-/--	-/--
24. CBTE should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.	5/31.3	9/56.3	2/12.5	-/--	-/--
25. This consortium's school district administrators approve of CBTE.	4/25.0	8/50.0	2/12.5	1/6.3	1/6.3

APPENDIX E (3) - Continued

Organizational Change Variables	Responses by Frequency/Percent				
	1	2	3	4	5
26. I received feedback from others in regard to my CBTE design performance.	2/12.5	7/43.8	5/31.3	2/12.5	-/--
27. I had to communicate with IHE administrators to design a CBTE plan.	1/6.3	7/43.8	5/31.3	-/--	3/18.8
28. I like to work with the task force members.	5/31.3	7/43.8	4/25.0	-/--	-/--
29. The task force leader provided me with the necessary kinds of CBTE design assistance.	5/31.3	5/31.3	5/31.3	1/6.3	-/--
30. CBTE should lead to more effective teacher performance.	4/25.0	10/62.5	2/12.5	-/--	-/--
31. This consortium's school teachers unions approve of CBTE.	4/25.0	7/43.8	5/31.3	-/--	-/--
32. I received feedback from my own administrative superior in regard to my CBTE design performance/role.	2/12.5	6/37.5	6/37.5	1/6.3	1/6.3
33. I had to communicate with policy board members to design a CBTE plan.	2/12.5	7/43.8	3/18.8	2/12.5	2/12.5
34. Communication among task force members focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.	5/31.3	7/43.8	4/25.0	-/--	-/--
35. IHE administrators were concerned with what the task force thought about CBTE.	3/18.8	6/37.5	5/31.3	2/12.5	-/--
36. CBTE should ultimately lead to more effective student performance.	5/31.3	7/43.8	4/25.0	-/--	-/--
37. The initial results of CBTE in the preparation of teachers in other states have been positive.	-/--	5/31.3	7/43.8	1/6.3	3/18.8
38. Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by task force members only.	3/18.8	3/18.8	3/18.8	4/25.0	3/18.8
39. I had little freedom to control CBTE design events.	-/--	2/12.5	2/12.5	8/50.0	4/25.0
40. Communication between the task force and the policy board focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.	2/12.5	8/50.0	5/31.3	1/6.3	-/--
41. IHE administrators supported the task force's CBTE design efforts.	2/12.5	11/68.8	3/18.8	-/--	-/--
42. Our CBTE plan should lead to more effective teacher performance.	5/31.3	9/56.3	2/12.5	-/--	-/--
43. CBTE's principles and components are difficult to understand.	1/6.3	4/25.0	3/18.8	6/37.5	2/12.
44. Decisions about designing the CBTE plan were made by task force members only.	2/12.5	1/6.3	2/12.5	7/43.8	4/25.
45. I was allowed little initiative in designing a CBTE plan.	-/--	1/6.3	1/6.3	6/37.5	8/50.
46. IHE administrators spent adequate time with the task force.	1/6.3	6/37.5	6/37.5	1/6.3	2/12
47. Our CBTE plan should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.	4/25.0	10/62.5	2/12.5	-/--	-/-
48. It took too much time to design a CBTE plan.	2/12.5	2/12.5	3/18.8	3/18.8	6/37
49. Decisions about designing the CBTE plan were made by personnel outside the task force.	-/--	2/12.5	5/31.3	5/31.3	4/25
50. There were conflicting expectations held about the task force's CBTE design role.	-/--	3/18.8	9/56.3	3/18.8	1/6

APPENDIX E (3) - Continued

Organizational Change Variables	Responses by Frequency/Percent				
	1	2	3	4	5
51. I was held accountable for my CBTE design role.	4/25.0	6/37.5	6/37.5	-/--	-/--
52. Communication between the task force and IHE administrators focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.	1/6.3	6/37.5	6/37.5	2/12.5	1/6.3
53. IHE administrators provided CBTE design information.	-/--	8/50.0	2/12.5	2/12.5	4/25.0
54. Our CBTE plan should provide useful teacher training information.	7/43.8	6/37.5	2/12.5	-/--	1/6.3
55. It was easy to design a CBTE plan.	-/--	-/--	5/31.3	4/25.0	7/43.8
56. Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by personnel other than those in the task force.	1/6.3	3/18.8	5/31.3	5/31.3	2/12.5
57. I received adequate compensation from my own organization for my CBTE design role.	-/--	1/6.3	9/56.3	1/6.3	5/31.3
58. As a task force member, I was adequately involved in designing a CBTE plan.	4/25.0	4/25.0	6/37.5	1/6.3	1/6.3
59. IHE administrators provided the task force with the necessary kinds of CBTE design information.	-/--	4/25.0	10/62.5	2/12.5	-/--
60. Our CBTE plan should set up a more rational and systematic method for training teachers.	1/6.3	6/37.5	9/56.3	/--	-/--
61. When CBTE details were first presented to the task force, its objectives were clearly defined.	-/--	4/25.0	9/56.3	2/12.5	1/6.3
62. As a task force member, I participated to the extent that I desired in making CBTE design decisions.	3/18.8	6/37.5	6/37.5	1/6.3	-/--
63. When CBTE details were first presented to the task force, findings about its effects in training teachers were not mentioned.	3/18.8	3/18.8	9/56.3	-/--	1/6.3
64. The task force was not kept well informed on the CBTE design decisions and actions taken by the policy board.	-/--	1/6.3	9/56.3	4/25.0	2/12.5
65. Materials and supplies which were necessary for designing a CBTE plan were not provided on time.	-/--	1/6.3	8/50.0	3/18.8	4/25.0
66. Procedures for setting up a CBTE plan were clearly defined by the policy board.	2/12.5	5/31.3	6/37.5	3/18.8	-/--
67. Task force meetings were scheduled when design problems were encountered.	2/12.5	6/37.5	7/43.8	1/6.3	-/--

TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS = 16

Response Key: 1 = strongly agree
2 = agree
3 = neither agree nor disagree
4 = disagree
5 = strongly disagree

APPENDIX F

APPENDIX F

ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLES FOR ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE VARIABLES

1. Change Variable: I approve of CBTE.

   Grouping: One Year or Four Year Registration

Task Force
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	5.5804	1	5.5804		
Within Groups	4.8571	14	.3469	16.085	.001
TOTAL	10.4375	15			

Group	$\bar{x}$
1. One Year	1.1429
2. Four Year	2.3333

2. Change Variable: Task Force members were given a useful inservice training program.

   (a) Grouping: Public or Private IHE

Task Force
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	6.5641	1	6.5641		
Within Groups	15.4359	14	1.1026	5.953	.027
TOTAL	22.0000	15			

Group	$\bar{x}$
1. Public IHE	3.6667
2. Private IHE	2.3333

(b) Grouping: Public or Private IHE

IHE
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	5.0381	1	5.0381		
Within Groups	15.7619	18	.8757	5.753	.026
TOTAL	20.8000	19			

Group	$\bar{x}$
1. Public IHE	4.1667
2. Private IHE	3.0714

3. Change Variable: CBTE is a more rational and systematic method for training teachers.
Grouping: One Year or Four Year Registration

Task Force
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3.8135	1	3.8135		
Within Groups	11.9365	14	.852	4.473	.051
TOTAL	15.7500	15			

Group	$\bar{x}$
1. One Year	1.5714
2. Four Year	2.5556

4. Change Variable: IHE administrators approve of CBTE.

Grouping: Large or Small IHE

IHE
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3.7500	1	3.7500		
Within Groups	12.8000	18	.7111	5.273	.032
TOTAL	16.5500	19			

Group $\bar{x}$

1. Large IHE: 2.6000
2. Small IHE: 1.6000

5. Change Variable: Sufficient CBTE design assistance was given to the task force.

Grouping: Public or Private IHE

IHE
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	6.6881	1	6.6881		
Within Groups	16.2619	18	.9034	7.403	.014
TOTAL	22.9500	19			

Group $\bar{x}$

1. Public IHE 3.[illegible]333
2. Private IHE [illegible].714

6. Change Variable: The State Education Department set up many CBTE design rules and procedures.

(a) Grouping: Public or Private IHE

Task Force
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	6.7708	1	6.7708		
Within Groups	14.6667	14	1.0476	6.463	.023
TOTAL	21.4375	15			

Group	$\bar{x}$
1. Public IHE	2.3333
2. Private IHE	4.0000

(b) Grouping: Public or Private IHE

IHE
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	11.6667	1	11.6667		
Within Groups	25.3333	18	1.4074	8.289	.010
TOTAL	37.0000	19			

Group	$\bar{x}$
1. Public IHE	2.3333
2. Private IHE	4.0000

7. Change Variable: I was able to influence our group's educational policies/decisions.
Grouping: Large or Small IHE

IHE
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	8.2881	1	8.2881		
Within Groups	22.2619	18	1.2368	6.701	.018
TOTAL	30.5500	19			

Group	$\bar{x}$
1. Large IHE	3.3333
2. Small IHE	1.9286

8. Change Variable: The policy board leader supported my CBTE design efforts.
Grouping: Public or Private IHE

Policy Board
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	4.6667	1	4.6667		
Within Groups	16.6667	22	.7576	6.160	.020
TOTAL	21.3334	23			

Group	$\bar{x}$
1. Public IHE	3.000
2. Private IHE	1.667

9. Change Variable: Our group members approve of CBTE

Grouping: One Year or Four Year Registration

IHE
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	6.3354	1	6.3354		
Within Groups	22.4646	18	1.2480	5.076	.035
TOTAL	28.8000	19			

Group $\bar{x}$

1. One Year 1.7777
2. Four Year 2.9090

10. Change Variable: I was able to influence the design of the CBTE plan.

Grouping: Public or Private IHE

Task Force
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3.8478	1	3.8478		
Within Groups	7.5897	14	.5421	7.098	.018
TOTAL	11.4375	15			

Group $\bar{x}$

1. Public IHE 3.3333
2. Private IHE 2.0769

11. Change Variable: Our group leader provided CBTE design information.
Grouping: One Year or Four Year Registration

Task Force
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3.9375	1	3.9375		
Within Groups	4.0000	14	.2857	13.781	.002
TOTAL	7.9375	15			

Group $\bar{x}$

1. One Year 3.0000
2. Four Year 2.0000

12. Change Variable: CBTE should lead to more effective teacher preparation.
Grouping: One Year or Four Year Registration

Task Force
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	1.8343	1	1.8343		
Within Groups	4.6032	14	.3288	5.579	.032
TOTAL	6.4375	15			

Group $\bar{x}$

1. One Year 1.4286
2. Four Year 2.1111

13. Change Variable: Consortium school district administration approve of CBTE.
Grouping: Large or Small IHE

IHE
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	4.8167	1	4.8167		
Within Groups	11.7333	18	.6519	7.389	.014
TOTAL	16.5500	19			

Group $\bar{x}$

1. Large IHE 2.9333
2. Small IHE 1.8000

14. Change Variable: I received feedback from others in regard to my CBTE design performance/role.
Grouping: Large or Small IHE

IHE
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	6.0167	1	6.0167		
Within Groups	22.9333	18	1.2741	4.722	.041
TOTAL	28.9500	19			

Group $\bar{x}$

1. Large IHE 2.8667
2. Small IHE 1.6000

15. Change Variable: Consortium school teacher's unions approve of CBTE.
Grouping: Large or Small IHE

IHE
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	4.2667	1	4.2667		
Within Groups	16.5333	18	.9185	4.645	.043
TOTAL	20.8000	19			

Group	$\bar{x}$
1. Large IHE	3.6667
2. Small IHE	2.6000

16. Change Variable: CBTE should lead to more effective student school performance.
Grouping: Large or Small IHE

Task Force
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3.1920	1	3.1920		
Within Groups	5.7455	14	.4104	7.778	.014
TOTAL	8.9375	15			

Group	$\bar{x}$
1. Large IHE	1.6364
2. Small IHE	2.6000

17. Change Variable: Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by task froce members only.
Grouping: Large or Small IHE

Policy Board
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	13.0208	1	13.0208		
Within Groups	46.3125	22	2.1051	6.185	.020
TOTAL	59.3333	23			

Group $\bar{x}$

1. Large IHE 3.6875
2. Small IHE 2.1250

18. Change Variable: I had little freedom to control the CBTE design events.
Grouping: Large or Small IHE

IHE
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	7.3500	1	7.3500		
Within Groups	29.6000	18	1.6444	4.470	.047
TOTAL	36.9500	19			

Group $\bar{x}$

1. Large IHE 3.4000
2. Small IHE 2.0000

19. Change Variable: Communication between the task force and policy board focused on exchange of CBTE design information.

(a) Grouping: One Year or Four Year Registration

Policy Board
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	5.7110	1	5.7110		
Within Groups	9.6224	22	.4374	13.057	.002
TOTAL	15.3334	23			

Group	$\bar{x}$
1. One Year	3.2000
2. Four Year	1.5000

(b) Grouping: Public or Priviate IHE

Policy Board
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	2.3810	1	2.3810		
Within Groups	12.9524	22	.5887	4.044	.054
TOTAL	15.3334	23			

Group	$\bar{x}$
1. Public IHE	3.0000
2. Private IHE	2.0476

20. Change Variable: Decisions about designing the CBTE plan were made by personnel outside the task force.
Grouping: Large or Small IHE

Policy Board
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	6.0208	1	6.0208		
Within Groups	29.9375	22	1.3608	4.424	.045
TOTAL	35.9583	23			

Group	$\bar{x}$
1. Large IHE	3.1875
2. Small IHE	4.2500

21. Change Variable: I was held accountable for my CBTE design role.
Grouping: One Year or Four Year Registration

Task Force
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	4.3214	1	4.3214		
Within Groups	5.4286	14	.3878	11.145	.005
TOTAL	9.7500	15			

Group	$\bar{x}$
1. One Year	2.7143
2. Four Year	1.6667

22. Change Variable: It was easy to design a CBTE plan.

Grouping: Program

Policy Board
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	11.5333	3	3.8444		
Within Groups	19.3000	20	.9900	3.8833	.041
TOTAL	28.3636	23			

Group $\bar{x}$

1. Elementary	3.9000	3. Special	1.0000
2. Speech	3.0000	4. Other:Secondary	5.0000

23. Change Variable: Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by personnel outside the task force.

Grouping: Large or Small IHE

Policy Board
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	6.7500	1	6.7500		
Within Groups	20.8750	22	.9489	7.114	.014
TOTAL	27.6250	23			

Group $\bar{x}$

1. Large IHE	3.2500
2. Small IHE	4.3750

24. Change Variable: I received adequate compensation from my own organization for my CBTE design role.
Grouping: Large or Small IHE

Task Force
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	4.3682	1	4.3682		
Within Groups	11.3818	14	.8130	5.373	.035
TOTAL	15.7500	15			

Group $\bar{x}$

1. Large IHE 3.2727
2. Small IHE 4.4000

25. Change Variable: IHE administration provided the task force with the necessary kinds of CBTE design assistance.
Grouping: One Year or Four Year Registration

Task Force
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	2.0992	1	2.0992		
Within Groups	3.6508	14	.2608	8.050	.013
TOTAL	5.7500	15			

Group $\bar{x}$

1. One Year 3.2857
2. Four Year 2.5556

26. Change Variable: When CBTE details were first presented to me (or my group), research findings were not mentioned.

(a) Grouping: One Year or Four Year Registration

Task Force
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	4.1915	1	4.1915		
Within Groups	11.7460	14	.8390	4.996	.040
TOTAL	15.9375	15			

Group $\bar{x}$

1. One Year 3.1429
2. Four Year 2.1111

(b) Grouping: Public or Private IHE

IHE
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	13.0381	1	13.0381		
Within Groups	31.7619	18	1.7646	7.389	.014
TOTAL	44.8000	19			

Group $\bar{x}$

1. Public IHE 1.1667
2. Private IHE 2.9286

26. Change Variable: When CBTE details were first presented to me (or my group), research findings were not mentioned.

(a) Grouping: One Year or Four Year Registration

Task Force
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	4.1915	1	4.1915		
Within Groups	11.7460	14	.8390	4.996	.040
TOTAL	15.9375	15			

Group $\bar{x}$

1. One Year 3.1429
2. Four Year 2.1111

(b) Grouping: Public or Private IHE

IHE
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	13.0381	1	13.0381		
Within Groups	31.7619	18	1.7646	7.389	.014
TOTAL	44.8000	19			

Group $\bar{x}$

1. Public IHE 1.1667
2. Private IHE 2.9286

27. Change Variable: Our group was not kept well informed on the CBTE design decisions and action taken by the other group.

Grouping: Public or Private IHE

IHE
ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	8.8595	1	8.8595		
Within Groups	15.6905	18	.8717	10.164	.005
TOTAL	24.5500	19			

Group $\bar{x}$

1. Public IHE 2.8333
2. Private IHE 4.2857

28. Change Variable: Task force meetings were scheduled when problems were encountered in designing a CBTE plan.

Grouping: One Year or Four Year Registration Task Force

ANOVA Table

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Between Groups	3.9375	1	3.9375		
Within Groups	6.0000	14	.4286	9.187	.009
TOTAL	9.9375	15			

Group $\bar{x}$

1. One Year 3.0000
2. Four Year 2.0000

APPENDIX G

Principal Components Factor Analysis of Organizational Change Variables

IHE
Policy Board
Task Force

APPENDIX G

Principal Components Factor Analysis of Organizational Change Variables -- IHE Respondents

Variable Category	Factor Membership, R2± .500									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. CBTE should provide sufficient teacher education information for teacher trainers.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2. I approve of CBTE.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3. Task force members were given a useful CBTE design inservice training program.	-	-	.501	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4. CBTE is a more rational, systematic method for training teachers.	.852	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5. Administrators in this IHE approve of CBTE.	-	-	.579	-	-	-	-	-	-	.548
6. Sufficient CBTE design assistance was given to the task force.	-	-	.765	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7. The State Education Department set up many CBTE design rules and procedures	-	-	-	.583	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. I was able to influence the task force's educational policies/decisions.	.510	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
9. The task force leader approves of CBTE	-	-	.535	.509	-	-	-	-	-	-
10. The task force was given an orientation session which helped them understand the CBTE design requirements	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
11. I was able to influence the policy board's educational policies/decisions	-	-	.606	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
12. CBTE is a more accountable method for training teachers.	.838	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
13. Task force members approve of CBTE.	.538	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Variable Category	Factor Membership, R2± .500									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
14. Sufficient CBTE design funds were made available to the consortium.	-	-.654	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
15. I was able to influence the CBTE design	-	.712	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16. CBTE should lead to more effective preparation of teachers	.863	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
17. This consortium's school district administrators approve of CBTE.	.661	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.598	-	-
18. I received feedback from others in regard to my CBTE design performance/role.	-	-	-	-	-.586	-	-	-	-	-
19. CBTE should lead to more effective teacher performance.	.892	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20. This consortium's school teachers' unions approve of CBTE	.766	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
21. I received feedback from my own administrative superior in regard to my performance/role.	-	.530	-	-	-	-.562	-	-	-	-
22. CBTE should ultimately lead to more effective student performance.	.832	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
23. The initial results of CBTE in the preparation of teachers in other states have been positive.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
24. Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by task force members only.	-	.587	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
25. I had freedom to control the CBTE design events.	.607	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
26. Communication between the task force and the policy board focused on the exchange of CBTE design information	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

APPENDIX G (continued)

Variable Category	Factor Membership, R2± .500									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
27. Our CBTE plan should lead to more effective teacher performance.	.816	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
28. CBTE's principles and components are difficult to understand	-	-	-	-	-	-	.534	-	-	-
29. Decisions about designing the CBTE plan were made by task force members only.	-	.684	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
30. I was allowed little initiative in designing a CBTE plan.	-	-	-	-	-.513	-	-	-	-	-
31. Our CBTE plan should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.	.884	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
32. It took too much time to design a CBTE plan.	-	-	-	-	-.620	-	-	-	-	-
33. Decisions about designing the CBTE plan were made by personnel outside the task force.	.621	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
34. There were conflicting expectations held about my CBTE design role.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
35. I was held accountable for my CBTE design role.	-	.598	-	-	.573	.505	-	-	-	-
36. Communication between the task force and me focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.	-	.505	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
37. IHE administrators provided CBTE design information.	-	.521	-	-	-	-.529	-	-	-	-
38. Our CBTE plan should provide useful teacher training information.	.770	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
39. It was easy to design a CBTE plan.	-	-	-	.622	-	-	-	-	-	-
40. Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by personnel outside the task force.	.578	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Variable Category	Factor Membership, R2± .500 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
41. I received adequate compensation from my own organization for my CBTE design role.	-	-.506	-	-	.563	-	-	-	-	-
42. I was adequately involved in designing a CBTE plan.	.578	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
43. Our CBTE plan should set up a more rational, systematic method for training teachers	.703	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
44. When CBTE details were first presented to me its objectives were clearly defined.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
45. I participated to the extent that I desired in making CBTE design decisions.	.740	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
46. When CBTE details were first presented to me, findings about its effects in training teachers were not mentioned.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
47. The task force was not kept well informed on the CBTE design decisions and actions taken by the policy board.	-	-	.536	.600	-	-	-	-	-	-
48. Materials and supplies which were necessary for designing a CBTE plan were not provided on time.	-	-.506	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
49. Procedures for setting up a CBTE plan were clearly defined by the policy board.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.516	-	-

Total Number of Respondents - 19

APPENDIX G(2)

Principal Components Factor Analysis of Organizational Change Variables -- Policy Board Respondents

Variable Category	Factor Membership, R2± .500 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. CBTE should provide sufficient teacher education information for teacher trainers.	-	-	-	-	-	-	.615	-
2. I approve of CBTE.	.696	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3. Task force members were given a useful CBTE design inservice training program.	.609	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4. There were many rules and procedures describing the policy board's design role.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5. Members of the policy board were able to influence the consortium's educational policies/decisions.	.748	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6. The policy board leader was concerned with what I thought about CBTE.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7. CBTE is a more rational and systematic method for training teachers.	.750	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Administrators in this IHE approve of CBTE.	.869	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
9. Sufficient CBTE design assistance was given to the task force	.745	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10. The State Education Department set up many CBTE design rules and procedures.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
11. I was able to influence the policy board's educational policies/decisions.	.634	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
12. The policy board leader supported my CBTE design efforts.	-	.614	-	-	-	-	-	-
13. The policy board leader approves of CBTE.	.661	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
14. The policy board was given an orientation session which helped me understand the CBTE design requirements.	.653	-	-.547	-	-	-	-	-
15. I had to communicate with the other policy board members to design a CBTE plan.	.667	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
15. The policy board leader spent adequate time with me.	.530	.55	-	-	-	-	-	-
17. CBTE is a more accountable method for training teachers.	.506	-.658	-	-	-	-	-	-

APPENDIX G (2) (continued)

Variable Category	Factor Membership, R2± .500 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
18. Policy board members approve CBTE.	.867	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
19. Sufficient CBTE design funds were made available to the consortium.	.549	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20. I had to communicate with the policy board leader to design a CBTE plan.	.579	.587	-	-	-	-	-	-
21. I was able to influence the CBTE design.	.599	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
22. The policy board leader provided CBTE design information	.534	.535	-	-	-	-	-	-
23. CBTE should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.	.761	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
24. This consortium's school district administrators approve of CBTE.	.780	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
25. I received feedback from others in regard to my CBTE design performance/role.	-	-	-	-.550	-	-	-	-
26. I liked to work with the policy board members.	.711	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
27. The policy board leader provided me with the necessary kinds of design assistance.	.532	.515	-	-	-	-	-	-
28. CBTE should lead to more effective teacher performance.	.583	.70498	-	-	-	-	-	-
29. This consortium's school teachers' unions approve of CBTE	.706	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
30. I received feedback from my own administrative superior in regard to my CBTE design performance/role.	-	-	-	-.683	-	-	-	-
31. Communication among policy board members focused on the exchange of CBTE design information	.667	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
32. CBTE should ultimately lead to more effective student performance.	.573	-.61399	-	-	-	-	-	-
33. The initial results of CBTE in the preparation of teachers in other states have been positive.	-	-	.645	-	-	-	-	-
34. Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by task force members only.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
35. I had little freedom to control CBTE design events.	.566	.54421	-	-	-	-	-	-

APPENDIX G (2) (continued)

Variable Category	Factor Membership, R2± .500 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
36. Communication between the task force and the policy board focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.	.617	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
37. Our CBTE plan should lead to more effective teacher performance.	.505	-.69711		-	-	-	-	-
38. CBTE's principles and components are difficult to understand.	-	-	-	-	.550	-	-	-
39. Decisions about designing the CBTE plan were made by task force members only.	-	-	.721	-	-	-	-	-
40. I was allowed little initiative in designing a CBTE plan.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.639
41. Our CBTE plan should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.	.609	-.61480	-	-	-	-	-	-
42. It took too much time to design a CBTE plan.	-	-	.511	-	-	.519	-	-
43. Decisions about designing the CBTE plan were made by personnel outside the task force.	-	-	.682	-	-	-	-	-
44. There were conflicting expectations held about the policy board's CBTE design role.	-	-	.627	-	-	-	-	-
45. I was held accountable for my CBTE design role.	-	-	-	-	-	-.521	-	-
46. Communication between the policy board and IHE administrators focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
47. IHE administrators provided CBTE design information.	.572	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
48. Our CBTE plan should provide teacher training information.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
49. It was easy to design a CBTE plan.	-	-	-	.683	-	-	-	-
50. Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by personnel other than those in the task force.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
51. I received adequate compensation from my own organization for my CBTE design role	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
52. As a policy board member, I was adequately involved in designing a CBTE plan.	.525	-	-	-	.675	-	-	-

APPENDIX G (2) (continued)

Variable Category	Factor Membership, R2± .500 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
53. Our CBTE plan should set up a more rational, systematic method for training teachers.	.630	-.508	-	-	-	-	-	-
54. When CBTE details were first presented to the policy board, its objectives were clearly defined.	.509	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
55. As a policy board member, I participated to the extent that I desired in making CBTE design decisions.	.503	-	-	-	.583	-	-	-
56. When CBTE details were first presented to the policy board, findings about its effects in teacher trainings were not mentioned	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
57. The policy board was not kept well informed on the CBTE design decisions and actions taken by the task force.	.501	-	-	-.576	-	-	-	-
58. Materials and supplies which were necessary for designing a CBTE plan were not provided on time.	.607	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
59. Policy board meetings were scheduled when design problems were encountered.	-	-	-	.579	-	-	-	-

Total Number of Respondents - 25

APPENDIX G (3)

Principal Components Factor Analysis of Organizational Change Variables -- Task Force Respondents

Variable Category	Factor Membership, $R2 \geq .500$						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. CBTE should provide sufficient teacher education information for teacher trainers.	.641	-	-	-	-	-	-
2. I approve of CBTE.	.537	-.622	-	-	-	-	-
3. Task force members were given a useful CBTE design inservice training program.	.739	-	-	-	-	-	-
4. There were many rules and procedures describing the task force's CBTE design role.	.658	-	-	-	-	-	-
5. Members of the task force were able to influence the consortium's educational policies/ decisions.	.666	-	-	-	-	-	-
6. The task force leader was concerned with what I thought about CBTE	.533	-	-	-	-	-	-
7. CBTE is a more rational and systematic method for training teachers.	.696	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Administrators in this IHE approve of CBTE.	.879	-	-	-	-	-	-
9. Sufficient CBTE design assistance was given the task force.	.793	-	-	-	-	-	-
10. The State Education Department set up many CBTE design rules and procedures.	-	.533	-	-	-	-	-
11. I was able to influence the task force's educational policies/ decisions.	.813	-	-	-	-	-	-
12. The task leader supported my CBTE design efforts.	.730	-	-	-	-.523	-	-
13. The task force leader approves of CBTE	.754	-	-	-	-	-	-
14. The task force was given an orientation session which helped me understand the CBTE design requirements.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
15. I had to communicate with the other task force members to design a CBTE plan.	.771	-	-	-	-	-	-
16. I was able to influence the policy board's educational policies/decisions.	.625	-	-	-	-	-	-
17. The task force leader spent adequate time with me.	.699	-	-	-	-	-	-

APPENDIX G (3) (continued)

Variable Category	Factor Membership, R2± .500						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. CBTE is a more accountable method for training teachers.	.639	-.578	-	-	-	-	-
19. Task force members approve of CBTE.	.761	-	-	-	-	-	-
20. Sufficient CBTE design funds were made available to the consortium.	.814	-	-	-	-	-	-
21. I had to communicate with the task force leader to design a CBTE plan.	.823	-	-	-	-	-	-
22. I was able to influence the CBTE design.	.777	-	-	-	-	-	-
23. The task force leader provided CBTE design information.	.676	.579	-	-	-	-	-
24. CBTE should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.	.715	-	-	-	-	-	-
25. This consortium's school district administrators approve of CBTE.	.697	-	-	-	-	-	-
26. I received feedback from others in regard to my CBTE design performance	.605	-	-	-	-	-	-
27. I had to communicate with IHE administrators to design a CBTE plan.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
28. I like to work with the task force members.	-	-	-	-.511	-	-	-
29. The task force leader provided me with the necessary kinds of CBTE design assistance.	.686	-	-	-	-	-	-
30. CBTE should lead to more effective teacher performance.	.797	-	-	-	-	-	-
31. This consortium's school teachers' unions approve of CBTE	.667	-	-	-	-	-	-
32. I received feedback from my own administrative superior in regard to my CBTE design performance/role.	.609	-	-	-	-	-	-
33. I had to communicate with policy board members to design a CBTE plan.	.741	-	-	-	-	-	-
34. Communication among task force members focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.	.732	-	-	-	-	-	-
35. IHE administrators were concerned with what the task force thought about CBTE.	.514	-	-	-	-	-	-
36. CBTE should ultimately lead to more effective student performance.	.731	-	-	-	-	-	-

APPENDIX G(3) (continued)

Variable Category	Factor Membership, R2± .500						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
37. The initial results of CBTE in the preparation of teachers in other states have been positive.	-	-.579	-	-	-	-	-
38. Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by task force members only.	.563	-	-	.506	-	-	-
39. I had little freedom to control CBTE design events.	.658	-	-	-	.508	-	-
40. Communication between the task force and the policy board focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.	.726	-	-	-	-	-	-
41. IHE administrators supported the task force's CBTE design efforts.	.603	-	.562	-	-	-	-
42. Our CBTE plan should lead to more effective teacher performance.	.846	-	-	-	-	-	-
43. CBTE's principles and components are difficult to understand.	-	-	-	.523	-	-	-
44. Decisions about designing the CBTE plan were made by task force members only.	-	-	-	.548	-	-	-
45. I was allowed little initiative in designing a CBTE plan.	.581	-	-	-	-	-	-
46. IHE administrators spent adequate time with the task force.	.588	-	-	-	-	-	-
47. Our CBTE plan should lead to more effective preparation of teachers.	.835	-	-	-	-	-	-
48. It took too much time to design a CBTE plan.	.596	-	-	-	-	-	-
49. Decisions about designing the CBTE plan were made by personnel outside the task force.	.595	-	-	-	-	-	.662
50. There were conflicting expectations held about the task force's CBTE design role.	.536	.556	-	-	-	-	-
51. I was held accountable for my CBTE design role.	.644	-	-	-	-	-	-
52. Communication between the task force and IHE administrators focused on the exchange of CBTE design information.	.594	-	.567	-	-	-	-
53. IHE administrators provided CBTE design information.	-	-	.832	-	-	-	-
54. Our CBTE plan should provide useful teacher training information.	.572	-	-.517	-	-	-	-
55. It was easy to design a CBTE plan.	.816	-	-	-	-	-	-

APPENDIX G(3) (continued)

Variable Category	Factor Membership, R2± .500 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
56. Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by personnel other than those in the task force.	.619	-	-	-	-	-	-
57. I received adequate compensation from my own organization for my CBTE design role.	.650	-	-	-	-	-	-
58. As a task force member, I was adequately involved in designing a CBTE plan.	.754	-	-	-	-	-	-
59. IHE administrators provided the task force with the necessary kinds of CBTE design information.	.726	-	-	-	-	-	-
60. Our CBTE plan should set up a more rational and systematic method for training teachers.	.612	-	-	-	-	-	-
61. When CBTE details were first presented to the task force, its objectives were clearly defined.	.693	-	-	-	-	-	-
62. As a task force member, I participated to the extent that I desired in making CBTE design decisions.	.583	.586	-	-	-	-	-
63. When CBTE details were first presented to the task force, findings about its effects in training teachers were not mentioned.	.553	-	-	-	-	-	-
64. The task force was not kept well informed on the CBTE design decisions and actions taken by the policy board.	.643	-	-	-	-	-	-
65. Materials and supplies which were necessary for designing a CBTE plan were not provided on time.	.662	-	-	-	-	-	-
66. Procedures for setting up a CBTE plan were clearly defined by the policyboard.	.705	-	-	-	-	-	-
67. Task force meetings were scheduled when design problems were encountered.	_	.658	-	-	-	-	-

Total number of respondents - 16

APPENDIX H

Stepwise Multiple Regression of the Organizational Change Variables as Predictors of Four Year Program Registration of CBTE:

IHE
Task Force
Policy Board

Appendix H (1)

Stepwise Multiple Regression of the Organizational Change Variables* as Predictors of Four Year Program Registration of CBTE: IHE Perceptions

Variable Category	Step Number	Cumulative Indicators		
		Correlation (R)	Variance (R^2)	Increase in R^2
Sufficient CBTE design funds were made available to the consortium	1	.5804	.3368	.3368
I was allowed little initiative in designing a CBTE plan	2	.7218	.5211	.1842
There were conflicting expectations held about my CBTE design role	3	.7809	.6098	.0887
Task force members were given a useful CBTE design inservice training program	4	.8408	.7070	.0972
Decisions about CBTE plan content were made by task force members only	5	.8957	.8022	.0952
I approve of CBTE	6	.9275	.8639	.0617
Procedures for setting up a CBTE plan were clearly defined by the policy board	7	.9517	.9058	.0419
IHE administrators provided CBTE design information	8	.9666	.9342	.0285
I was adequately involved in designing a CBTE plan	9	.9773	.9550	.0208

* Other variables were listed in the equation, but their contribution to predicted variance was less than two percent.

Total number of respondents - 19

Stepwise Multiple Regression of the Organizational Change Variables as Predictors of Four Year Program Registration of CBTE: Policy Board Perceptions

Variable Category	Step Number	Cumulative Indicators: Correlation (R)	Cumulative Indicators: Variance (R^2)	Increase in R^2
I approve of CBTE	1	.5103	.2604	.2604
Members of the policy board were able to influence the consortium's educational policies/decisions	**2	.5845**	.3416**	.0812**
Communication between the policy board and IHE administrators focused on the exchange of CBTE design information	3	.6575	.4323	.0907
Our CBTE plan should lead to more effective teacher performance	4	.7075	.5005	.0682
I had to communicate with the other policy board members to design a CBTE plan	5	.7910	.6256	.1251
Members of the policy board were able to influence the consortium's educational policies/decisions.	**6 removed	.7906**	.6250**	.0006**
CBTE is a more rational and systematic method for training teachers	7	.8328	.6935	.0685
When CBTE details were first presented to the policy board, its objectives were clearly defined	8	.8569	.7343	.0407
I had to communicate with the policy board leader to design a CBTE plan	9	.8771	.7694	.0351
The policy board was not kept well informed on the CBTE design decisions and actions taken by the task force	10	.9083	.8251	.0557
The policy board leader was concerned with what I thought about CBTE	11	.9264	.8581	.0331
Communication among policy board members focused on the exchange of CBTE design information	12	.9459	.8948	.0367
Policy board meetings were scheduled when design problems were encountered	13	.9589	.9195	.0247
TOTALS: 11 Variables		.9589	.9195	

* Other variables were listed in the equation, but their contribution to predicted variance was less than two percent.

** Variable initially entered at Step 2 in Regression, subsequently removed at Step 6.

Total number of respondents - 25

Appendix H (3)

Stepwise Multiple Regression of the Organizational Change Variables* as Predictors of Successful Institutionalization of CBTE: Task Force Respondents

Variable Category	Step Number	Cumulative Indicators		
		Correlation (R)	Variance (R^2)	Increase in R^2
Task force members were given a useful CBTE design inservice training program	1	.8006	.6409	.6409
The task force was not kept well informed on CBTE design decisions and actions taken by the policy board	2	.8644	.7472	.1063
As a task force member, I was adequately involved in designing a CBTE plan	3	.9019	.8134	.0662
Communication between the task force and IHE administrators focused on the exchange of CBTE design information	4	.9468	.8964	.0830
I was held accountable for my CBTE design role	5	.9691	.9391	.0427
Materials and supplies which were necessary for designing a CBTE plan were not provided on time	6	.9851	.9705	.0314
TOTALS; 6 variables		.9851	.9705	

* Other variables were listed in the equation, but their contribution to predicted variance was less than two percent.